AMERICAN
Ecclesiastical Review.

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FOR THE CLERGY.

Vol. VII. 1892.

"*Ut Ecclesia aedificationem accipiat.*"
1. Cor. XIV. 5.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
D. J. GALLAGHER & CO., PUBLISHERS,
420 LIBRARY STREET.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—JULY, 1892.—NO. 1.

AN IDEAL SCHOOL BILL.

IN spite of the vigor with which the struggle for Catholic education has been maintained for so many years in this country, it is a noteworthy fact that we are still without a definite plan, a practical proposition, on which all Catholics may unite as expressing fully and formulating accurately their legitimate demands. We justly complain, that the State taxes us for the support of a system of education of which we can not conscientiously make use. We insist upon the inalienable right and indispensable duty of parents to educate their own children, or to entrust them to teachers of their own choice, and to have them trained in religion and morality simultaneously with secular instruction, under positive and continuous religious influences. As a necessary inference from these principles, we do not fail to point out that if the State takes our money for education, it ought, in all justice, to devote a fair proportion of the funds arising from such taxation to the education of our children according to a method of which we can avail ourselves. All this has been explained and demonstrated with luminous clearness and superabundance of argument in the columns of every Catholic periodical that has existed in the United States.

But the practical questions as to how this conclusion is to be put into execution, what measures are to be taken by the State in order to ascertain the amount of money that it ought to apply to the aid of voluntary associations, how this money is to be paid, and on what conditions and with what guarantee—all these points seem to have received very little attention at the hands of Catholic writers in this country.

Yet the want of such a definite practical proposition, which shall embody all of our claims and represent our idea, is obviously a very great disadvantage. Without it we must continue to beat the air. One who does not know precisely and clearly what he wants, is likely to get nothing. In the absence of such a concrete, plain, practical demand, controversy about principles is apt to produce only irritation. Indeed, we find that after years spent in expounding truths apparently so clear as to need only to be stated in order to win acceptance, the impression that we have succeeded in making upon the average Protestant mind amounts only to this, that the Catholic Church is opposed to every system of public schools, and is bent on breaking them down !

Now if we possess a *scheme* embodying our chief demands in practical form, our own efforts would undoubtedly become far more united, enthusiastic and powerful. We should then have a plan of campaign, a rallying cry, an objective point of operations. On the other hand, our non-Catholic fellow-citizens, seeing our requirements in concrete form, would understand them much more readily. The obvious fairness of our claims would appear irresistibly from their mere statement. We may depend upon it, that when a fair claim, a just contention, is placed clearly before the American public, it will meet with prompt acceptance. Hence, in order to have our demands acceded to, we have only to state them boldly, clearly, persistently, and with full trust in their inherent strength and justice. And this is practicable only by the aid of some such statement or proposition as we have described.

The views here expressed are not of recent growth ; they have long been in the mind of the present writer, and no doubt also of others better versed in the theoretical aspects of the school question. Of late, they have been presented to the consideration of a mind fitted, as perhaps no other in the country is, by philosophical talent and training, legal experience and erudition, to body them forth in definite and legislative form. The result is the draft of a "Bill for the Improvement of Education in the State," which accompanies the article in this number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, from the pen of Martin F. Morris, LL. D., Dean of the Legal Faculty and Professor of Constitutional law in Georgetown University. On this proposed bill we may be permitted a few comments.

Such a draft must, of course, have the nature of a suggestion merely. It is not presented as a perfect or final statement of the claims of voluntary education on the State. Even were it such a

perfect statement, it would still be subject to modification and changes, where local circumstances, in the judgment of competent authority, demand limitation or temporary compromise.

The requirements to be met by a practical programme of this nature would seem to be the following :

1st. *It ought to provide for the payment by the State of the actual expenses of voluntary free schools, whether Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, or belonging to any other religious or non-religious body.* We do not ask for ourselves what we are not willing to grant to others.

2nd. *On the other hand, it ought to offer to the State a sufficient guarantee that the money so appropriated is well and honestly spent, and that the secular instruction given is satisfactory in grade.*

3d. *These purposes ought to be accomplished without the sacrifice of any portion of parental control, or of absolute freedom of religious and moral instruction. Moreover, the plan adopted must not attack the present system of public schools.* While we can not ourselves make use of those schools, we offer no objection to their being utilized by others. If our non-Catholic friends choose to delegate their parental control to the State, and to employ the latter as schoolmaster, with the exclusion of religious teaching, we may judge their course most unwise and deleterious to the best interests of their families : but we arrogate to ourselves no right to interfere with their free choice.

Our belief is that the bill framed by Mr. Morris maps out broadly the lines on which these requirements may be successfully verified in every particular.

Its first clause provides, that when any body of men, any voluntary association, whether it be Church, club or society organized expressly for the purpose, shall provide a school building, fill it with a certain number of pupils (which number may, of course, be variously determined in different localities), and give to these pupils free education of a satisfactory degree of perfection for the period of one scholastic year, the actual expense of such school shall be defrayed from the common fund. Under this provision, all parish schools at present existing, whether under Catholic or non-Catholic auspices, would be presumably entitled, upon application to the school board and examination of the pupils, to adequate State support.

The second requirement is also abundantly fulfilled. What better guarantee can the Government desire of the sincerity and earnest-

ness of the managers, than that they should be willing to undertake the risk and labor of establishing the school, erecting a building, securing and paying teachers for at least one year, with the mere probability of reaching the required standard and receiving the reimbursement of their actual expenses? The payment of the money may, of course, be surrounded with all the checks and safeguards usually adopted by business men in such cases; sworn vouchers may be required, careful auditing of accounts, etc., etc. It is, moreover, stipulated in the bill, that the cost for every pupil shall in no case exceed the rate of expense in the public schools, including, of course, a fair rent of the buildings. In our parish schools, it is needless to say, the expenditure will ordinarily be much lower in proportion, and hence the system will be economical to the Government. It may perhaps be argued, that in strict justice Catholic public schools would be entitled to receive payment from the Government at the same rate per pupil as is given to State schools of equal grade, whether the actual expense of carrying on the schools be the same or not. But such a claim would be, to say the least, impracticable; and we are confident that whatever may be the case with other denominations, Catholics, at least, will be willing to waive all right to compensation beyond the actual expenses incurred, however moderate they may prove in comparison with the outlay upon the State schools.

That the standard of teaching be sufficiently high is secured by the periodical examination of the pupils by the School Board. No doubt, some will desire a provision that the examining board should comprise a certain proportion of members belonging to the body controlling the school; and in localities where prejudice runs high, this may perhaps prove advisable or even necessary to secure a fair test. But when principles are secured, it is better, in general, to leave details to amicable adjustment, or local determination.

The last requirement that we have laid down, is, perhaps, the most difficult of fulfillment. If possible, no portion of parental control must be bargained away for the money of the State. Matters in which the parental control chiefly needs to be exercised, such as religious and moral instruction, must remain absolutely unlimited; so that the teacher may be free to improve every opportunity, whether in the recitation of the catechism, or the commentary upon lessons in history, geography, or reading, or on any other of the thousand occasions that present themselves, to inculcate implicitly and explicitly the most important of all truths and the precepts and

practices of right and holy living. In this way only can our children be brought up in a Catholic atmosphere, redolent of those traditions and modes of thought and speech and all the other insensible influences that make of faith a second nature and of purity and prayer an instinct.

Yet while this freedom is reserved to those who wish to retain it, the present system of public schools from which it is excluded, must be left intact for the use of the citizens preferring it.

In the bill drafted by Mr. Morris, these purposes are attained, as it seems to us perfectly, and with a simplicity which is one of the weightiest recommendations of the plan. Nothing is granted to the State but the periodical inspection and examination of the pupils and the necessary safeguards for the proper expenditure of the funds. The selection, engagement, and dismissal of teachers, the choice of text-books, the supervision and regulation of the pedagogic methods employed—in a word, the entire management of the school, is left in the hands of the individual parents and their accredited representatives. Even the framing of the curriculum, the choice of the branches to be taught, is left in their hands ; for the bill provides only that the course shall be substantially equal in grade to that followed in the State schools. Thus for instance, if the patrons of any school conclude that the detailed study of physiology at so early an age as that at which it is commenced in some of our High, or even Grammar schools, is not calculated to improve the minds and morals of their children, they are allowed, under a fair construction of the bill, to omit this subject from the course, or supply its place with another study.

The objection may be urged, that the necessity of providing a building for the school and defraying its expenses for at least one scholastic year before being admitted to a share in Government aid, is a hardship, an unfair burden upon the parent, and thus far a curtailment of his rights. It is undoubtedly a hardship ; and the proposed bill is, in this point, greatly inferior in generosity to that granted by the Catholic majority of Belgium to its opponents. In that country, when twenty families belonging to one locality petition the State for a school suited to their own views, the Government is obliged to establish it, and to meet all costs from the beginning. But let us remember, that we must be willing to give to the State satisfactory evidences of sincerity and efficiency in the establishment of the school. Indeed, we ourselves, as a part of the State, would naturally desire some such guarantee from other asso-

ciations applying for Government aid. The most evident proof that can be given will consist in the fact of the school's having been put into actual and successful operation. If, in accomplishing this end, some temporary hardship be experienced, this fact will involve no sacrifice of principle, and will be more than compensated by the benefits gained.

While maintaining intact the rights of parents, the proposed law in no way antagonizes the public school system. It simply admits the parochial schools to a share in the benefits of that system. That both will profit vastly by the competition engendered, can be doubted by no one who holds to true American ideas of business.

In conclusion, we beg to repeat what has already been incidentally remarked, that the *scheme* here presented makes no pretension to authority of any kind, beyond what may be due to its merits. It is a suggestion of what, in the opinion of the present writer, would be a thoroughly satisfactory solution of the school question, in localities where circumstances may permit of its being put in practice. Should it have the good fortune to unite Catholic sentiment in its favor, it will undoubtedly prevail; for in our country, he who knows his rights and stoutly insists on having them, will sooner or later win a favorable hearing. If, however, the proposition be judged inadequate or impracticable, it may, we hope, have the merit of eliciting comment and criticism, and thus, by the clearing up and crystallizing of ideas, may prepare the way for a truly IDEAL SCHOOL BILL.

HENRY L. RICHARDS.

A BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

THAT both intelligence and virtue are equally necessary for the existence and the perpetuation of republican institutions, is an axiomatic truth recognized as such by all publicists and by all true statesmen whenever there has been question of such institutions. Now, it is equally true, that intelligence is the result of education; and virtue, of religious training. For, while ignorance is unquestionably the fruitful parent of vice, it does not by any means follow, that intelligence is the necessary concomitant of virtue. On

the contrary, the worst crimes that have disgraced the annals of humanity are the crimes of those whose intellects have been highly trained without a corresponding education of their moral and religious natures. Experience has conclusively demonstrated, that the education of the head without the education of the heart, is a menace and a danger to society. And hence it is, that the Catholic Church has ever strenuously insisted that both should go together; and that the secular and the religious education must be concurrent, and practically simultaneous.

It is presumed that no Christian of any denomination, no one in fact, except the atheist and the blasphemer, the man of irreligious mind or corrupt heart, will deny the essential truth of this position. The argument is, that while the two should go together, and while it is admitted that, under our present circumstances and possibly under any circumstances, the matter of religious training is entirely for the parent or family, yet the work of secular instruction may be, and should be undertaken, and even controlled and monopolized by public authority. It is said that either the State should give the secular instruction exclusively, remitting or leaving religious and moral training to the parent, or to the instrumentalities selected by the parent; or that the State may blend moral training with secular instruction, on the theory that morality may be segregated from religion and taught and practiced without it.

Let us examine this position for a moment; and let us consider the latter alternative first.

Can morality be separated from religion? and can there be a morality so separated, which the State may teach and by which the youthful mind can be trained to virtue? Deists and infidels, like Volney, Voltaire and Diderot, have agreed in favor of a morality dissociated from the sanctions of revealed religion. But every true philosopher, and every reasonable man, knows that such arguments are the merest sophistry. The sentiment of honor is not the equivalent of virtue, and the philosophy of Deism has proved to be the Gospel of Crime. The sentiment of honor and the spirit of human kindness, preached by the Deist or the Agnostic as a substitute for the dictates of positive religion, so far as they are at all capable of influence upon human action, are efficacious solely in so far as they are founded upon positive religion. In fact, this agnostic morality consists of the Ten Commandments with the first Commandment omitted—a superstructure without a foundation—a series of prohibitions and restrictions upon the human passions, which,

whenever they are not the merest hypocrisy and cloak of immorality, are without any reason and are enforced only by the limitations of a most flexible expediency.

But we are directed to men of high reputation and irreproachable character in the community, who profess no special religious belief and entertain no well-defined religious convictions, and yet are claimed to be bright and shining illustrations of this secular morality. It is difficult to deal seriously or patiently with such arguments as this. The illustrations are generally as false as the theories are rotten. There is not, and there cannot be, any morality without religion. What sometimes seems to be such is but the feeble twilight from a sun that has set.

But conceding, as it must be conceded, that morality can not exist independently of religion, are there not some primary and fundamental rules of morality upon which we all agree, and which may be taught without reference to dogmatic religion? For it seems to be assumed that there is a dogmatic religion and a religion that is not dogmatic. The assumption is the merest nonsense. Religion must necessarily be dogmatic; it can not by any possibility be otherwise. Religion is a system of fundamental truths, with corresponding ethical duties, and there can be no duty that is not based upon some correlative dogmatic truth.

But we differ in our religion, and therefore we differ in our views as to what constitutes dogmatic truth. We agree perhaps upon some dogmas, and we differ as to others. Can we not select those upon which we agree, and make them the basis of morality? No, we can not; it would be simply an impossibility. The basis of agreement is too narrow and impracticable. But after all are we not all in substantial accord upon the principle of morality and duty that should control our conduct towards each other? May we not teach the brotherhood of man, and ignore the fatherhood of God? Most undoubtedly not. The brotherhood of man does not exist without the fatherhood of God.

It might be admitted, perhaps, that we can all be good and virtuous in our way, if we are sincerely honest in that way. But this implies that we must be taught in that way, and taught to be honest in that way, and taught to believe that way to be the true way, and this at once implies denominationalism in our education, and we all unanimously admit that the State should not teach denominationalism.

Moral training, therefore, without religious instruction is simply

an absurdity and an impossibility, and the State is incompetent to give it. The only alternative is secular instruction by the State without any religious or moral training whatever, the latter being left entirely to the parent, or to the Church or such other instrumentality as the parent may select.

Experience, however, shows that it is impossible to separate secular instruction from moral training. God can not be and will not be, eliminated from the world. Moral training is not a distinct or separate science, like arithmetic, or grammar, or writing. It is not a distinctive object to be placed before the youthful mind at specified hours, and ignored for the rest of the time. On the contrary, true moral training should be continuous and yet should be generally disguised and indistinct. It should permeate everything, and yet rarely be made the subject of independent and direct instruction. It should be the result of the conditions that surround the pupil, rather than the effect of distinct and specific effort to inform his mind or direct his heart to virtue. And it is precisely because these conditions are generally, if not invariably, absent in our Common School system of education, that this system, whenever it is not decidedly Protestant or Anti-Catholic, is decidedly godless and irreligious.

But assuredly reading, writing and arithmetic, the three rudimentary branches of all secular education, may be taught without any effort of moral training or interference with religious convictions? This is precisely what cannot be done without disaster. It is precisely at the very time when these rudimentary branches are taught, that the moral nature of the youthful mind is fashioned for good or for evil, for all time. And to control its impressions for good, while this primary instruction is in process of being given, is the special effort of the Catholic Church. We may as well understand, once for all, that there is no middle ground between good and evil, no state of indifference, no condition of neutrality. And if the youthful mind is not instructed for good, it is necessarily indoctrinated for evil.

Now, with us, it is conceded beyond question, that the State may not assume to teach religious dogma. From that which we have already stated, it is a logical and necessary result of this proposition, that the State may not teach morality. And it is a further inevitable inference, that it cannot safely attempt to teach at all, without some attempt to teach morality, except at the risk of breeding immorality.

We do not desire to be understood as holding that the State should entirely ignore religion and morality. It cannot do it, and continue to exist. But there is a vast difference between recognition and teaching. It is, indeed, the duty of the State to foster both religion and morality, and to the same degree and in like manner it is its duty to foster education.

There is another consideration of potent force for us as citizens of a Republic. We assert unhesitatingly that only the enemies of republican institutions, secret or avowed, conscious or unconscious, can favor the idea of paternalism in Government. Paternalism is nothing but absolutism or despotism in disguise—infinitely worse in a republic than in a monarchy; infinitely worse, because the despotism of a mob is always worse than the despotism of a single individual. The very essence of civil liberty is that we should all be free to do as we please, as long as we do not trespass on the rights of others, and the essential theory of a Republic is that it should never, under any circumstances, assume to control or restrict individual freedom, except to protect the rights of others from unauthorized trespass. It has been aptly said, that the true and sole function of Government is that of a policeman, to keep the peace between us. Government should never assume to do for us what we can equally well or better do for ourselves. Government should not assume to do for us what it might perhaps do better for us than we could do for ourselves, provided we can do it reasonably well for ourselves; for the intervention of Government almost of necessity brings evils in its train far greater than the inconveniences resulting from the inadequate instrumentalities of individual action. There are many things, of course, which are beyond the power of individual action to accomplish efficiently; and the complicated relations of modern society are constantly enlarging the number of these subjects proper for governmental action. But the true patriot and the true statesman will always regard with suspicion all movements, the tendency of which is to enlarge the sphere of governmental action while restricting the scope of individual freedom. Hence, it is true, upon this principle, that individual cooperation, association and combination, whether in the shape of voluntary organizations or corporate bodies, are better instrumentalities than the State for the accomplishment of such enterprises as are beyond the power of individual action. Power must be reposed in the people, but arbitrary and unnecessary power can with no more propriety be committed to an irresponsible populace than to

a hereditary monarch. The lowest and most revolting degradation of despotism will have been reached, when socialism, which is but a phase of paternalism, shall have been ingrafted upon democracy. For, when that shall have been accomplished, Caesarism and monarchy will be hailed as a relief from the intolerable tyranny of the mob.

We presume that no honest man, who has any adequate idea of the meaning of republican institutions, will seek to controvert the truth of these propositions as purely abstract propositions of political economy. For paternalism in a republic is an infamy.

Now, upon principle, we would ask, what better right has the State to undertake the care of our education than it has to take charge of our morals? What greater propriety is there in the assumption by the State of the functions of an educator than in its undertaking to provide us with the necessaries of life, or with the opportunity to procure them? The very suggestion is sometimes repelled with indignation by the most ardent admirers of the Common School system, but the socialist is more logical when he admits and advocates the equal right and duty of Government to take the entire control of all the agencies of individual action. Assuredly it can not be denied by any reasonable man, that the daily bread of the citizen is of equal importance with his education; and that if the State may properly provide him with the one, it may, with equal propriety, provide him with the other. It may provide him with the tools of trade and the implements of labor just as properly as with the mental appliances by which intellectual operations are accomplished.

But probably we reason in vain, when we reason against an existing or accomplished fact. The Common School system is an existing institution; and no true statesman and no good citizen will ever attempt to overthrow an existing institution until he is ready to replace it with something demonstrably better. The Common School system is not without merit, and while we believe that its influences are not in all respects for good, and that it has a tendency, as it now exists, to sap the foundations of our political and social morality, we would, under present circumstances, view its destruction with regret. We may remark, however, that its worst enemies are those inconsiderate admirers of it, who would enlarge its scope so as to make it embrace the languages, music, and the ornamental branches of education, and who would extend it so far as finally to comprise the college and the university as part of the system. For

when this is done, it ceases to be the Common School system of the people. It becomes, what it is now rapidly becoming, the means by which the designing few and the unprincipled rich procure the education of their children at the cost of the many, and to the exclusion of the children of the poor for whose use and benefit the system was originally designed. When the system is so overloaded, then it will necessarily fall of its own weight ; or the Republic will fall from the excessive paternalism which such overloading will imply. The people will awaken to a sense of the fact, that taxes are wrung from the toiling millions to support a system from which only a favored few will reap the benefit.

We would not have this consummation. We would not have the system endangered by excessive enlargement. We Catholics are willing to contribute our taxes and our good wishes toward the continuance of the system, provided the State does not make a monopoly of the instruction of youth, and provided we are left free to show that individual action and private effort can upon equal terms produce equal or better results.

What the State requires for the perpetuation of its institutions, is that there should be adequate primary education in the rudimentary branches of learning, not that it should necessarily give that education itself. On general principles, if that education can be given by individual effort—by the parent to whom it properly belongs by the law of nature, or by such instrumentalities as the parent may select to aid in the work, it will be all the better for the State. For it can be done more efficiently, at less expense, and without the danger inherent in the assumption of power that savors of paternalism. This it is which Catholics propose to do, in the first instance, at their own expense; and their claim is, that if they do this successfully and to the satisfaction of the State, then their schools should be placed upon a footing of equality with those of the State.

While, as an abstract principle, we can not concede the right of the State even to provide that education should be given, we may, for the purpose of the present argument, concede the right. And to the same extent, and subject to the same qualification, it might be conceded that, when the parent fails to provide a proper education for his child, the State may intervene to do so, or at all events to provide the instrumentalities by which he may secure that education for his child. But our position is that, when the parent is ready and willing to do his part, he should not be placed at a disadvan-

tage by undue competition and a virtual monopoly on the part of the State. We Catholics claim that, on principle, the right of education belongs solely and exclusively to the parent, and not to the State. We prefer our own schools under our management for the education of our children. We do not like the influences and the moral atmosphere of the public schools. We are entirely willing, and even desirous, that for those parents who prefer the public schools, they should continue to be maintained. But when parents of any religious denomination, feeling that the Common School system fails to give the class of training which they would prefer, establish schools under such influences as they desire, it would seem to be but a simple act of justice that they should be left free to do so, and that they should not be antagonized by the Common School system, or have their own institutions crushed out of existence by it as by a monopoly which will brook no equal and no rival.

How may we conciliate the continued existence of the Common School system with the legitimate demand of those, be they Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, or what they may, who prefer their own private schools? Of course, we are all free to have our private schools now, but we are not free to have them on equal terms with the Common Schools. We pay our taxes to support the Common School system, and we can not conscientiously have any benefit from the Common School system, as now administered. Can not the system be administered so as to preserve all the benefits and all the advantages inherent in it, and at the same time do justice to those who object on conscientious grounds to avail themselves directly of them for the purposes of education? The problem is not an insoluble one. Let us establish schools of our own on the basis of the State system; let the education given in these schools be given to the satisfaction of the State, and when it has been determined under the supervision of the State that such education is satisfactory, let those schools be virtually aggregated to the Common School system —not merged in it, but simply aggregated.

It appears to us, that legislative enactments to give effect to these suggestions are neither difficult nor impracticable if the subject is approached in a spirit of reason and conciliation. And we would submit the annexed draft of a bill as a basis for such legislation, subject, of course, to such modification and amendment as might be requisite in different localities.

MARTIN F. MORRIS.

A BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF EDUCATION IN THE STATE.[1]

Be it enacted, etc., etc.,

That whenever any individual, or body or association of individuals, or any organization of persons, incorporated or unincorporated, shall have established a school for the free education of youth in the primary branches of education, to wit, reading, writing and arithmetic, and such school shall have been in existence for the term of at least one year, with not less than . . . . . pupils in regular attendance, and shall have been submitted to a satisfactory inspection and examination thereof by the State or local board of school trustees, or such other persons as may from time to time be designated for the purpose, the person or persons, association or organization conducting and managing such school, shall be entitled to receive from the State (or city, or county, or district) each year such remuneration as may be sufficient to defray the cost of the management of such school, including therein the rent (or rental value) of the building in which the same is located, or a sum equal to the annual interest on the cost thereof, if the same should be owned by the persons or association conducting such school; *provided, always*, that the cost hereby provided to be paid shall not be rateably greater than the cost of maintaining and conducting the public schools of the State; and that such rateable cost shall be determined by the board of school trustees, subject to the supervision of the Courts having equity jurisdiction in the several districts or localities.

2. Such compensation shall be paid annually from time to time; *provided*, that such schools shall be always open at reasonable times for inspection, as aforesaid, and that the pupils shall have passed a satisfactory examination at such stated times as may be determined by the board of school trustees in accordance with usages and regulations in force for the public schools of the State.

3. The board of school trustees shall have power, subject to the control of the several Courts, to make all proper rules and regulations for the inspection and examination herein provided to be made; provided, that such inspection and examination shall not extend beyond the branches of secular education taught or intended to be taught in such schools; and the said boards of trustees shall

1 Drafted by the Hon. M. F. Morris, LL. D.

not have any management or control of said schools beyond such inspection and examination.

4. The provisions of this act shall apply only to primary and grammar schools, or schools in which the course of study is substantially equal to that in use in the public schools of the State.

THE CARDINAL PREFECT ON THE ELECTION OF AMERICAN BISHOPS. [1]

THERE is nothing very surprising in the fact that amid this modern tendency toward democratic government there should have arisen in the Church in America a spirit which seeks to substitute for the approved methods of ecclesiastical rule those which approach more closely to popular suffrage. Yet the idea that the authority of a ruler is derived directly through the people cannot be applied to the Church without destroying the very notion of her divine commission to speak and act as lawgiver and guide of man.[2]

It is to the assertion of this principle, according to which the hierarchy of the Church of Christ represents the immediate divine authority addressing itself to man, that the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda devotes his recent letter to the American Episcopate. He points out in the first place that abuses have obtained here and there in the election of Bishops which destroy the right order of things and create strife and scandal. Attempts have been made, especially in recent years, by parties and factors to control the choice of candidates endorsed by popular favor; and both clergy and laity have engaged in open and passionate contests to secure the election of their favorites irrespective of the true interests of the Church and without regard to Canonical procedure.

All this is the more deplorable because there exists a well understood and safe norm according to which the Bishops are to be chosen, and this not only for the Church at large but with especial

1 See *Epistola ad Episcopos Stat. Foeder. Americae* in the Analecta.

2 "It is of the most vital moment," says Edmund O'Reilly, "to understand that not a particle of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is derived from the people, either as its original source or as a divinely appointed channel. There is no parity whatever in this respect between the authority of Christian pastors and that of temporal rulers, whose power is, with great probability, held to come immediately from the people." *The Relations of the Church to Society*. Chap. iii, p. 34.

A BILL FOR THE PROMOTION OF EDUCATION IN THE STATE.[1]

Be it enacted, etc., etc.,

That whenever any individual, or body or association of individuals, or any organization of persons, incorporated or unincorporated, shall have established a school for the free education of youth in the primary branches of education, to wit, reading, writing and arithmetic, and such school shall have been in existence for the term of at least one year, with not less than . . . . . pupils in regular attendance, and shall have been submitted to a satisfactory inspection and examination thereof by the State or local board of school trustees, or such other persons as may from time to time be designated for the purpose, the person or persons, association or organization conducting and managing such school, shall be entitled to receive from the State (or city, or county, or district) each year such remuneration as may be sufficient to defray the cost of the management of such school, including therein the rent (or rental value) of the building in which the same is located, or a sum equal to the annual interest on the cost thereof, if the same should be owned by the persons or association conducting such school; *provided, always*, that the cost hereby provided to be paid shall not be rateably greater than the cost of maintaining and conducting the public schools of the State; and that such rateable cost shall be determined by the board of school trustees, subject to the supervision of the Courts having equity jurisdiction in the several districts or localities.

2. Such compensation shall be paid annually from time to time; *provided*, that such schools shall be always open at reasonable times for inspection, as aforesaid, and that the pupils shall have passed a satisfactory examination at such stated times as may be determined by the board of school trustees in accordance with usages and regulations in force for the public schools of the State.

3. The board of school trustees shall have power, subject to the control of the several Courts, to make all proper rules and regulations for the inspection and examination herein provided to be made; provided, that such inspection and examination shall not extend beyond the branches of secular education taught or intended to be taught in such schools; and the said boards of trustees shall

1 Drafted by the Hon. M. F. Morris, LL. D.

not have any management or control of said schools beyond such inspection and examination.

4. The provisions of this act shall apply only to primary and grammar schools, or schools in which the course of study is substantially equal to that in use in the public schools of the State.

THE CARDINAL PREFECT ON THE ELECTION OF AMERICAN BISHOPS. [1]

THERE is nothing very surprising in the fact that amid this modern tendency toward democratic government there should have arisen in the Church in America a spirit which seeks to substitute for the approved methods of ecclesiastical rule those which approach more closely to popular suffrage. Yet the idea that the authority of a ruler is derived directly through the people cannot be applied to the Church without destroying the very notion of her divine commission to speak and act as lawgiver and guide of man.[2]

It is to the assertion of this principle, according to which the hierarchy of the Church of Christ represents the immediate divine authority addressing itself to man, that the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda devotes his recent letter to the American Episcopate. He points out in the first place that abuses have obtained here and there in the election of Bishops which destroy the right order of things and create strife and scandal. Attempts have been made, especially in recent years, by parties and factors to control the choice of candidates endorsed by popular favor ; and both clergy and laity have engaged in open and passionate contests to secure the election of their favorites irrespective of the true interests of the Church and without regard to Canonical procedure.

All this is the more deplorable because there exists a well understood and safe norm according to which the Bishops are to be chosen, and this not only for the Church at large but with especial

1 See *Epistola ad Episcopos Stat. Foeder. Americae* in the Analecta.

2 " It is of the most vital moment," says Edmund O'Reilly, " to understand that not a particle of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is derived from the people, either as its original source or as a divinely appointed channel. There is no parity whatever in this respect between the authority of Christian pastors and that of temporal rulers, whose power is, with great probability, held to come immediately from the people." *The Relations of the Church to Society.* Chap. iii, p. 34.

reference to the conditions of the American country and people. The rules *De Electione Episcoporum* are minutely laid down in the Plenary Councils of Baltimore. They are the fruit of practical wisdom and contain explicit directions which place the Holy See in full possession of the character, the merits, the antecedents and the ability of those who, in regular order, might be proposed as candidates for a vacant Episcopal See. If the opinion of weighty authorities is thrown into the balance it is, nevertheless, not the sole nor even the principal motive which influences an appointment in which personal interest or personal affection can not easily reach the sovereign authority which must consider it as the wisest policy always to determine its choice on the evidence of merit and ability as proven by facts and results. Popular suffrage would largely ignore these facts, as is plain from the methods by which political party-leaders manage at times to influence the election of State officers.

As a remedy then against this evil which threatens to become more and more popular owing to the injudicious advocacy of it by certain ecclesiastical demagogues, Cardinal Ledochowski points out the necessity of making known to the clergy and people that such methods are contrary to the received and salutary discipline of the Church, and he desires that the right mode of electing Bishops be explained so that there may be no longer any uncalled for interference on the part of self-appointed electors.

THE METHOD OF ELECTING BISHOPS IN THE UNITED STATES.

In 1834 the Propaganda prescribed a method of electing Bishops in the United States which, although founded upon the traditional system of church administration in Europe, took into consideration the local circumstances of a newly opened and extensive country enjoying on the one hand perfect freedom of religious action, but hampered on the other by the scarcity of priests, the scattered condition of the people and the commonly limited resources for carrying out an efficient diocesan service. Additional provisions were made by the same congregation in 1850, again in 1856 and 1859.

Hitherto, the choice of a new Bishop was, as a rule, the outcome of the deliberations of the Bishops of a Province, each of whom presented one or more (three) names of those whom he considered worthy and capable of the charge. In May, 1859, the Prefect of the Sacred Congregation had addressed a letter to the Archbishops of the country, asking them to consider the existing method of elec-

tion and to suggest to the Holy See, in writing, such measures "as would secure, with more certainty, the choice of men eminent for learning, prudence, familiarity with the country, etc., and piety." The result of the answers thus obtained was a schema issued by the Propaganda which outlined in detail the manner of nominating a candidate and the qualities required in the latter. Each Bishop was to send to the S. Congregation at Rome, and at the same time to the Archbishop of his own Province, the names of those priests whom, from good knowledge, he considered worthy of the Episcopal dignity and capable to carry out its obligations. This was to be done every third year, so that the Holy See would be constantly kept informed as to the available candidates in each locality. On the occurrence of any vacancy a synod of all the Bishops of a Province was to be convened, in which they were to deliberate as to the immediate choice of a candidate, but only, after each of them had sent the names of those whom he considered most worthy to the Archbishops or the senior Bishop of the Province. This was apparently intended to lessen the danger of mutual influence being exercised at the synod by one or other of the Prelates in favor of a particular candidate. The qualities of the various persons recommended having been discussed publicly in the convention of the Bishops, the minutes of the assembly are to be sent to the Propaganda.

QUALITIES REQUISITE FOR ELECTION TO THE EPISCOPATE.

The qualifications demanded for a Bishop in the United States are implied in certain questions regarding the person proposed to the Holy See for a bishopric, and which are to be answered in writing according to the schedule here given.

I. Name, surname, age, native country of the candidate.
II. To what diocese and Ecclesiastical Province does he belong?
III. Where did he make his studies—and with what success?
IV. Has he any academical degrees? What are they?
V. Has he been professor at any time and in what branch?
VI. Has he done any missionary service, and has he gained any experience in the same?
VII. How many languages does he understand? What are they?
VIII. What offices has he held, and with what success?
IX. What degree of prudence has he shown in counsel and in action?

X. Does he enjoy health of body? Is he frugal, patient, practical?

XI. Is he firm of purpose, or of a changeable disposition?

XII. Does he enjoy a good reputation, or has there ever been a stain upon his moral conduct?

XIII. Is he attentive in the performance of his priestly functions, edifying in his outward demeanor, carefully observant of the rubrics?

XIV. Does his dress, his manner, his speech and his entire conduct betoken gravity and religious respect?[1]

In the last Plenary Council certain provisions were made by which certain representatives of the lower clergy obtained a voice in the election of Bishops.

They are as follows:—

Whenever a See becomes vacant the regular Consultors and irremovable Rectors of the Diocese for which a new Bishop is to be chosen assemble under the presidency of the Metropolitan or a Bishop, whom he appoints, and select three names of candidates on whom they unite as worthy of the dignity. If there is to be a nomination for the Metropolitan See, then the senior Bishop of the Province by right of ordination, or one whom he delegates, presides over this meeting. Every member of the clergy entitled to a vote takes an oath that in his choice he will not be influenced by personal interest or favor. The votes are to be cast by secret ballot. The names selected by the priests are then presented to the Bishop of the Province, by the Archbishop or the president of the meeting, together with a report of the proceedings signed by a secretary. At their subsequent synod the Bishops of the Province consider the names proposed by the clergy and any others which they themselves may present. They are obliged to consider the candidates offered by the Consultors and irremovable Rectors, although these have only what is called a consultive (not a determining) voice in the election. Of all the names presented the Bishops then select three which are to be submitted to the Holy See. Should these three names contain none of those offered by the clergy the Bishops are expected to give their reasons to the S. Congregation for the rejection.[2]

Such are, in brief, the rules which guide the electors in the choice of candidates for a bishopric. It would be difficult to imagine a

1 Concil. Plen. Balt. ii, Tit. iii, 107.
2 Cf. Concil. Plen. Balt. iii, Tit. ii, 15.

method more likely to safeguard the election against all undue influence. Merit and the approbation of grave and worthy men are the ordinary factors which determine the nomination of a candidate, and the appointment rests with one who is far away and above the narrow sphere of local attachment or personal interest.

CANTATE DOMINO.

Sing ye to the Lord a new canticle:
Let His praise be in the Church of the Saints.—Ps. 159, 1.

We propose, in this paper, to present an outline sketch of the present status of the argument for Congregational Singing.

I.

The subject is an old one and a new one. Song has been identified with every emotion of the human heart. It can still interpret and express when the language of words is dumb. It is as common an inheritance of man as Wordsworth's "meanest flower that blows;" and like it, too, can give

"Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

What wonder, indeed, if the "religious animal" should have consecrated music in an eminent fashion to the service of the religious sentiment of his race? And what wonder that in the worship of the true God the most sublime outpourings of the heart should have found expression no sooner in words than in melody? And so it was that when Israel saw the waters of the Red Sea close over the countless hosts of Pharaoh, "Moses and the children of Israel sung this canticle to the Lord, and said: Let us sing to the Lord, for he is gloriously magnified, the horse and the rider he hath thrown into the sea." And after the long canticle of praise had been finished, "Mary the prophetess the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went forth with her with timbrels and with dances; and she began the song to them saying: Let us sing to the Lord, for he is gloriously magnified, the horse and his rider he hath thrown into the sea." It is supposed, from the metrical cast of the song of Debbora and Barac, that it was designed to be used as a song for the whole people, with accompaniment of

musical instruments. The old Testament furnishes us with other "hymns of the songs of Sion;" while we have a link binding us to the new order in the hymn of the Last Supper—"And a hymn being said, they went out into Mount Olivet." A little while, and the song of the Church shall not die in the endless mazes of the Catacombs, but shall fill all the earth with the praises of the "Lamb that was slain, who is worthy to receive honor and benediction." If we should seek further illustration of the intimate connection between worship and song, we might speak of the use—a use which was a prostitution, surely, but nevertheless a very natural one, and this is our contention—of music *in hymning the obscene praises of Gods that* "have ears and hear not." But we feel that we are merely stating a truism; so much so, indeed, that we should willingly have omitted all illustration, if our truism had not been carefully labelled such, and put on a back shelf, out of the reach of the *profanum vulgus*, as though it were a poison meant only for professional use. Sooth to say, we are the heirs of a strange tradition which has changed our truism into a paradox. For if the religious feelings of our hearts seek vent as naturally in song as our thoughts do in speech, surely some violence has been done to our higher nature in these days, when the silence of the worshipper is the rule, and the religious song of the people a patent and rare exception. We have a new, and a very sad, application of the *lucus a non lucendo* principle in the implied logic of our ceremonial procedure: "it is natural for the people to praise God in song, all of our sublime Catholic liturgy is clothed in the graceful drapery of song, all the happiest part of tradition speaks to us in melody—therefore, the people can't sing, don't like to sing, can't be made to sing, and much prefer to have hired singers do the work for them." What shall we say? Time was when our fathers paid those who should "soothe the dull cold ear of death." (We might make some gruesome reflections here on the dullness and coldness of a worse death that may overtake our paid for piety.) Why should not the common sense which has revolted at such a hollow sham as hired mourners, support us too in a worthier cause?

II.

And so the subject of congregational singing, which was an old one, has become of late years a new one. The pity is that there should ever be occasion for introducing the subject as a "new" one. Doubtless, to many minds our subject has about it not the flavor of

an antiquity which it can vindicate to itself by clear historical title, but of a novelty which is apt to irritate the sensitive conservatism of even well informed people. Playful criticism has been passed on the "clumsy" dictum of Pope Stephen—*Nil innovetur nisi quod traditum est*—but here we have a case where it applies in its most rigorous literalness. *Quod traditum est*, a practice which has all the sanction of an ancient and glorious tradition, requires at this day *ut innovetur*, that it be introduced anew. What modern Pliny could speak of us as "singing by turns a hymn to Christ as to a God?" or what modern Tertullian could plead for us on the ground that the cheerful singing of our prayers testifies to the hope that is in us? Recognizing, then, and what is more to the point, appreciating the strong natural affinity existing between religious emotion and religious song, the advocates of congregational singing venture to put in a plea, not for a novelty, but for a departure from a comparative novelty. We plead, then, the cause of no novelty when, sheltering ourselves behind the form of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, we say to our people: "be ye filled with the Holy Spirit, speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord. . . ." (Eph. v, 18, 19.)

III.

Too much insistence can hardly be laid on the fact that the song of the whole people assembled to worship God after the liturgical forms of the Catholic Church, is by no means a new idea, or a new practice. "A primordiis Ecclesiae Psalmos et Hymnos in conventu Fidelium decantatos fuisse Apostolus asserit ad Ephesios scribens cap. 5, *loquentes vobismetipsis in Psalmis et Hymnis et Canticis spiritualibus:* quae verba de mutuo et alterno cantu intelligenda esse Interpretes docent; nec Sectarii audent negare hunc usum semper in Ecclesia viguisse. *De Hymnis et Psalmis canendis*, inquit Augustinus Epist. 119, cap. 18, *ipsius Domini et Apostolorum habemus documenta et exempla et praecepta.* Uberrime tractarunt hoc argumentum viri docti, quos cito in Tract. de Divina Psalmodia cap. 17, § 2, n. 3. Thus Card. Bona in his work Rer. Liturg. Tom. 2, Lib. i, Cap. 25, §19. He assigns as a reason for the action of the Fathers of the Council of Laodicea in forbidding the practice, the want of skill in singing decently. Quia tamen vix fieri poterat, quin ecclesiasticae harmoniae concentus populi canentis imperitia turbaretur, Patres Concilii Laodiceni C. 15, statuerunt, *non oportere praeter Canonicos*

cantores, qui suggestum ascendunt, et ex diphtera seu membrana cantant, quod nos dicimus ex libro, non autem memoriter, *alium quemlibet in Ecclesia psallere.* Verum hic Canon non fuit ubique receptus, ut ex allatis Cesarii et Chrysostomi testimoniis constat; idemque ipse Chrysostomus clarius ostendit hom. 1. de verbis Isaiae *vidi Dominum*, in qua acriter reprehendens psallentis populi cacophoniam, et immodestiam, non eos ut sileant monet sed ut scite et modeste concinant. In Gallia popularis cantus consuetudinem sublatam existimo paucis annis post Caesarium. Synodus enim II. Turonen. c. 4, sancivit, *ut laici secus altare, quo sacra mysteria celebrantur, inter clericos tam ad vigilias quam ad missas stare penitus non praesumant; sed pars illa, quae a cancellis versus altare dividitur, choris tantum psallentium pateat clericorum.* With regard to the last words quoted, Sala notes: Attamen viget adhuc haec consuetudo in Ecclesia Orientali, et in Occidentali quidem multa sunt oppida, et ea maxime ab urbibus distantia, in quibus Populus Ecclesiasticum cantum discit, simulque cum clero concinit; loca enim hujusmodi a civitatibus remotiora tenacius haerent antiquitati, et serius ad ea perveniunt, quae noviter instituuntur. And Bishop Lootens (1869) affirms that "in those countries where the faithful still take an active part in in the celebration of the offices of the Church, . . . in many Churches, and especially on some favorite feast day, there is hardly a silent voice in the congregation."

IV.

Other abundant testimony might be quoted to show the antiquity and universality of congregational singing. It is, therefore, by no means a "new" thing. And yet to a certain extent it is a new thing. For although, as Sala and Lootens show, the practice still exists in many places, linking the modern piety, through an unbroken succession of a genuine and devotional tradition, to the golden ages of earliest ecclesiastical discipline, still it remains true that "modern" church music has been very successful in creating and upholding a new caste of "singing men and singing women," and in bringing about a state of ceremonial aberration certainly never contemplated nor sanctioned by rubrics. "The present erroneous tradition," says Father Young,[1] "has taken the song out of the people's mouths and made them dumb and in great part listless lookers-on, spiritless and distracted, quickly wearied, and heartily

1 *Catholic World*, July, 1887.

glad when the religious performance is over. . . . . The canon of this false tradition has no sanction in the rubrics of the ceremonial. What is that canon? It is plainly this: All singing in the divine offices of the Catholic Church, save the chanting of the priest, is to be done by a select number of singers, commonly but incorrectly styled 'the chorus' and by them alone. . . . . So the widespread and pernicious tradition in church singing is due, in great measure, to the misuse of this little word 'choir.' It is a word of distinct and definite signification, constantly found in directive and preceptive rubrical laws, but employed more and more commonly, even to the ends of the earth, to convey quite another meaning, to imply a wholly opposite and forbidden order of things to that contemplated by the rubrics." This "choir" has monopolized everything so thoroughly and so persistently and so unquestioningly, that any attempt to return to the older order must seem a novelty. The effort is being made, and is receiving wide-spread attention. Various councils have latterly urged a return to the earlier discipline, and notably, the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore: "Valde exoptandum esse censemus ut rudimenta cantus Gregoriani in scholis parochialibus exponantur et exerceantur, sicque numero eorum qui psalmos bene cantare valent, magis magisque increscente, paulatim major saltem pars populi secundum primitivae Ecclesiae adhuc in variis locis vigentem usum vesperas et alia similia cum ministris et choro decantare addiscant."

V.

It may be objected that the authoritative recommendation thus bestowed on this revival in Church song contemplates merely the Gregorian Chant, and therefore an exclusive use of the Latin tongue; whereas the present movement *de facto* elevates the singing of melodies written in the modern tonalities and subject to the laws of modern rythms, as well as the use of the vernacular, into a prominence that should not be conceded them.

While we are pleading here for the principle of congregational song, and not specially urging the adoption of *vernacular* hymns, we may turn aside for a moment to consider the objection. As a matter of fact, much insistence has been made in England on the use of the vernacular, while the largest part of the books published in this country for congregational use is devoted to the same end. We must notice, however, that ample provision is made for the older Gregorian melodies, so that the liturgical requirements may

be perfectly met. The use of the English language may, within strict liturgical permission, be encouraged for many reasons, born, some of them, of the absolute necessities of the case, and others of them, of the undeniable power of the mother-tongue for instilling wholesome lessons of devotion and instruction. Of the successful introduction of vernacular congregational song in England we need not speak just now. In this country it is making successful headway and with gratifying results. We may simply note here the recommendation contained in the Pastoral Letter of the Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops of the Province of New York, Sept., 1883: "Most earnestly do we desire that our people should be accustomed to sing together, and for that object we wish that in all our schools the children should be taught the elements of music, and thus choral singing would soon become almost universal in our churches."[1] While, then, Latin must always be the official language of the Church—the language of her sublime liturgy—there are abundant intrinsic and extrinsic reasons for advocating the singing of English hymns in the many less official functions of the Church liturgy and ceremonial.

VI.

Father Taunton, in his little book, "The History and Growth of Church Music," makes a strong plea for the "modern" Masses *versus* an exclusive use of plain chant. Although these compositions really suppose women's voices, he sympathizes with the directions of the Provincial Councils of Westminster condemning "mixed" choirs and ordering, as soon as possible, the substitution of male choirs. "After twelve years of practical experience I am fully convinced that boys are quite capable of executing all Church music, that is all music which is good art and is worthy of the name of Church music." He remarks further on: "To some people the voice of a woman in church is absolutely repugnant, and I must confess that I am among the number who feel thus. *Mulier taceat in Ecclesia* is a blessed saying, and 'worthy of all acceptance.'" Perhaps some may be led to inquire whether the injunction of the Apostle might not apply to the matter of congregational singing? The subject has been touched upon before now, and by no less an authority than St. Ambrose:[2] Mulieres, quas Apostolus in Ecclesia tacere jubet,

1 Quoted in preface to "The Roman Hymnal," Rev. J. B. Young, S. J., whose book, containing many English hymns, received the *Imprimatur* of Cardinal McCloskey. A similar *Imprimatur* was bestowed on the Catholic Hymnal of Rev. Alfred Young, C. S. P., which is nearly all devoted to hymns in English.

2 Praef in Psal.

Psalmum etiam bene clamant. Hic omni dulcis aetati, hic utrique aptus est sexui; hunc juvenculae ipsae sine dispendio matronalis psallunt pudoris, puellulae sine prolapsione verecundiae cum sobrietate gravitatis Hymnum Deo inflexae vocis suavitate modulantur. Our quotation from the great Bishop of Milan may serve, not to prove that the Pauline restriction applies to the office of teaching, and not singing, but as an incentive to the piety of the devout sex in joining cordially in the movement of Church song.

VII.

Desiring to remove possible misapprehensions, we have devoted ourselves thus far to a negative treatment of our subject—perhaps at too great length. And yet it might not prove quite a useless task to conciliate attention to the antiquity and authoritative sanction of congregational singing, to its *constant* use in many districts that have held unwaveringly to the custom of the earliest ages, and to the ecclesiastical sanction of the movement looking toward a return to the ancient practice. We venture to submit in addition some considerations of a positive nature. We think, then, that congregational singing should be a corollary, not merely to the Psalmist's words which give a title to this paper, but as well to the nature and scope of sacred music, to its history, and to its present rather peculiar status.

VIII.

"Sing ye to the Lord a new Canticle," says the Royal Psalmist, "let His praise be in the church of the Saints." In this age of musical progress, when all the hymns and canticles and psalms, the Introits, Graduals, Offertories, and Communions, the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* and *Credo* and *Agnus Dei*, have received most elaborate melodic and harmonic treatment; when, if not with "shawm and the psaltery's sound," at least with the "full organ" our choirs sing the sacred words of the liturgy; when men singers and women singers are brought "from the uttermost lands o'er the uttermost seas" to sound hymns of praise in our temples—the imperative form of our borrowed title might seem to be needlessly emphatic. Nevertheless, if we turn it into the indicative mood, we shall not need much of a sense of humor to read therein a pungent irony. "Sing ye to the Lord" cried the Psalmist. But in our prodigal financial and artistic expenditures how often do we not imitate the example of Ecclesiastes:—"I made *me* singing men and singing

women!" The reporter who described the stirring prayer of a prominent divine as "one of the most eloquent prayers ever addressed to a Boston audience" should certainly be reporter of *sacred music* for the same journal. Now the people should go to church not to hear a cheap concert, but to give to the Lord their own service of praise. We shall not attempt either a proof of this, or an analysis of the spiritual aridity of our own times, to discover what share the silence of our churches, or that noise which is often worse than silence, may have had in the genesis of that aridity. But it is plain that song is the natural drapery of emotion. Religious song should, then, clothe religious emotion. The Church, recognizing this province of music, has with rarest exceptions, set all of her official prayer, whether of praise or petition, to music. But just as "clothes do not make," but may well adorn "the gentleman," so song, which should be the handmaid of prayer, should never become the mistress. No proof is necessary of the patent truth that "church music," to fulfill at once the office of natural exponent of devotion for the people who come together to worship God, and that other office of *subordination* to prayer, should be a song of the whole people, and not of half-a-dozen paid *employés*, and that such kind of music only can be correctly styled *sacred*, as will be content to *serve* and not to *govern* the expression of the soul. Does the artistic super-refinement of modern harmony give music to the people? In one sense, yes; and, as our church concerts are, like any concert, on the co-operative plan, rather cheaply for each individual auditor. But in another sense, has it not taken music away from our people? And that, too, at a very dear cost—the cost of enthusiastic piety; of the sympathy in the service of God which makes of many, one; of the very unity and completeness of the liturgy itself; at the cost, finally, of the *beauty of God's house*, and the decorum that should be observed *in the place where His glory dwelleth?*

We are pleading, not the cause of Gregorian Chant as an exclusive vehicle of the church prayer, but that of a song which can be sung by the people, whose interests, and not the interests of high art, are alone to be consulted in this matter. As Mr. Curwen, a musician of high ability has pointed out,[1] the argument for congregational singing is *devotional*, and not artistic. "It is, in fact, very hard to sustain that elevated mood which draws spiritual good from listening to others singing. The thing can be done, but it cannot

1 Studies in Worship Music, vol. 1, p. 331.

be done for long, it cannot be done constantly. We are always tempted to shrink from worshippers into critics."[1] Since, then, music and worship have such intimate, mutual relationship, it is the purpose of congregational singing both to restrict, as much as possible, our present vicarious utterances of the praise of God, and to give voice to that praise at times when "silence is audible" in our churches—not only "audible" but oppressive—e. g. at the early masses on Sundays.

IX.

The history of Sacred Music can wonderfully corroborate the claims we are urging here. It would show us what an important *rôle* the congregation has always played in the public offices of religion—always, alas! until the degeneracy in the style of Church Music which immediately preceded the degeneracy commonly styled the *Reformation*, made sad havoc with the great public and universal acts of devotion and religious duty. That history, while it would not adorn a tale, can at least point a moral: for may not much of the power of the Reformation for evil be fairly ascribed to the shrewd forethought of Luther in using the grand lever of song to spread abroad, and to lift thus into prominence, his strange doctrines? He knew how to turn a weapon of Truth against herself. And we have allowed to fall into disuse the great and ready instrument which he used with such success in his propagandism of error. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. Let heresy make the songs of the people, and it cares little what church may make its laws. Our own day sees those very services which are the official expression by the Church of its worship of God—Solemn Mass and the Divine Office—the most meagerly attended of all her services; and it sees, too, the barren formulas of the sects vivified into a strange activity and fertility by the breath of a common church song. When we consider, further, how little their hymnody appeals either to intellect or to heart, how evanescent is its piety, how vapid its sentimentality,—we must surely recognize the powerful instrumentality of a united congregational enthusiasm of song in perpetuating what should long since have died a quiet death of general debility.

There is surely little occasion for philosophizing on the mission of music in relation to church ceremonial, on the grand part it played

1 Ibid.

in the service of the Temple, on its natural office as the vehicle of emotion, on the reflex power it exerts on the soul in calling forth sentiment and emotion, on the universality of its power, extending over all ages and all climes—alas! we are living face to face with the sad object-lesson of what great use it serves in the cause of error, and of how the little recognition we accord it has resulted in the small attendance at the great public offices of the Church which require song as an essential part.

X.

But here we are reminded that we seem to neglect the claims of "Our Choir." We believe, then, that congregational singing should be a corollary of the present state of church music. This latter is a subject over which every one who treats it seems inclined to grow merry. The merriment is the startling, but withal natural revulsion of feeling consequent upon the utter inability to give fitting expression to chagrin and disappointment. The squatter who, in the far prairies of the West, left a dear wife and children in the morning, only to find, on his return home, a confused heap of bloody limbs and smoking ashes, found the only expression suitable for his emotion in the words: "Well! this—is—ridiculous!"

The ordinary spectacle afforded by the choir in the services of the church is full of such great and patent incongruities; is so common, and so little commented upon; has received such prescription by long and patient tolerance; its vanities and worldliness, its frothiness and insolence are accepted so thoroughly as a matter of course, that the moralist feels hopelessly baffled and overcome in his crusade against the Turk. What shall he do? The case is one that seems to call for a simple assertion of the first principles of common sense and common decency, for the eternal fitness of things is so plainly outraged! And yet he feels the implied insult of such a proceeding, and knows beforehand that those principles will be most cheerfully conceded. He begs to insist further, "why don't you apply the principles?" He is answered with a good-humored laugh that no logic can avail against, and a quiet changing of the subject. What wonder if his chagrin assumes the merry phase?

XI.

Our very familiarity with truth can often dull the keen edge of appreciation—we have eyes and see not. Would we might go further and say:—We have ears and hear not! for then surely much

of the evil of our present church music would be removed. This evil is not merely negative, inasmuch as it deprives the faithful of Christ of their proper opportunity of singing their canticles of praise to the *Lamb that was slain, who is worthy to receive praise and benediction;*—but it is also positive, inasmuch as the "dull, stale, flat and unprofitable" clamor that too often echoes through the courts of the Lord baffles the heavenly instinct of sacred song, the devotion that would worship without distraction, and the piety that would banish from the church all vanity, all self-seeking and self-ostentation, all sensual suggestiveness, nay, all scandal.

> Is one baffled by toad or by rat?
> The gravamen's in that!

(We borrow the strong Anglo-Saxon of Browning without other apology than that afforded by the nature of our subject.)

We have glanced rather hurriedly at some of the claims of the present movement for congregational singing. But the claims are so clear, that he who runs may read their lesson. The movement does not, on the one hand, assert the exclusive prerogative of Gregorian Chant to such an extent as to rail at all modern music; nor, on the other hand, avail itself wholly of modern rhythms and tonalities; but seeks rather a simple congregational song, partly Latin with ancient or modern setting, and partly English with modern setting. It looks, indeed, to an ideal, but will accept and accommodate itself to whatever necessary limitations the present conditions of our people impose. In a succeeding paper we hope to make some practical suggestions as to its introduction and maintenance amongst our people.

H. T. HENRY.

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MESSIANIC IDEA.

NOT so very long ago rationalistic criticism was principally concerned with the New Testament. At present the Catholic position as to this part of the Bible is being virtually conceded on all sides, and the Old Testament has become the main object of attack. The modern critics fully recognize the unity which exists between the Old Testament and the Gospels. Knowing well that the New is based on the Old, they try to undermine Christianity by attempting to prove the Hebrew books self-contradictory.

The study of the Old Testament in this connection is now more necessary than ever. We need a more universal recognition of its importance for religious knowledge, as many beauties of this part of Holy Scripture are yet to be laid open. Every attack on the Bible has indicated some phase of truth before somewhat neglected or perhaps not fully developed. By such attacks men have been spurred on to greater zeal in study, and the outcome has in every case proved a veritable gain for orthodoxy.

The true nucleus, round which centers all the matter of the Old Testament, is that revelation which prepared the human race for the Kingdom of God through the Messias. The Christology of the Old Testament is its essence. It is the link which connects the two grand divisions of the sacred books, and is related to the New Testament as the dawn to the day. Now the Christology of the Old Testament has been a special object of criticism, rationalists of to-day denying the existence of any direct Messianic prediction, though they admit a vague Jewish hope of future aggrandizement. Accordingly Messianic prophecy has become a study in itself, occupying the attention of a galaxy of bright minds, principally of the German school, Delitzsch, Oehler, Orelli, Hoffmann and others, whose zeal and learning have thwarted all attempts of purely negative critics. Christ Himself said in His discourse to the Pharisees, "Search the Scriptures . . . and the same are they that give testimony of me," John v, 39. The doctrinal truths of the holy writings, despite the age, style and character of the different books, were really an organic unit of which the final expression was Christ. We find in the New Testament ninety-four references to the prophecies of the Old Testament as foretelling Christ, and of these but forty-four were recognized as Messianic by the Jews.[1] This limited

1 Cf. Westcott "Introduction to the Study of the Gospel," p. 159.

number of references is due to the nature of the books of the New Testament, which cited these passages only as occasion allowed. Hence it has happened that many passages truly Messianic are entirely disregarded in the Gospels and epistles, *e. g.*, Isaias ix, 5, 6; Jer. xxiii, 5, 6; Zach. vi, 12, 13; but this deficiency was made good in the works of the Christian writers of the first and second centuries.[1]

Now, in treating our subject we shall follow the historic method, as history is really what a noted writer has called it, "the setting for the jewel of prophecy." It helps us to gain a true idea of revelation, and solves many of the objections brought against us. As Professor Day, of Yale, has said: "The best refutation of not a few of the strange and distorted representations of sacred history now persistently made, is the history itself." [2]

After stating the condition of the Messianic hope among the Jews, we shall mark its foundation and trace its progress through the biblical and post-biblical ages until its consummation in Christ.

A hope for the future is indispensable to any nation. "Hope is the soul of moral vitality." The past without a future, memory without hope are merely worms gnawing at the vitals. Self-complacency in a nation invariably leads to its disintegration. The hopes of various nations may be different, but there is in all the general necessity for looking forward "to rebuke despondency and direct enthusiasm." Israel was not exempt from this law, though the history of her past forms so great a part of the Old Testament. This hope is insisted on by her prophets and psalmists. She might have had her entire aspirations in the line of commerce, conquest or philosophy as her neighbors Phœnicia, Rome and Greece. In fact, she had them in a partial way under Solomon, Jehosophat and the later rabbins. This influence, however, was only accidental. Israel was steadily directed to a future greatly surpassing her past, and this time to come was made known to the people by a series of authoritative statements from Genesis to Malachy. Canon Liddon has rightly said that, "Israel was a church embodied in a political constitution." God was the first thought in the mind of the nation. To the Jew sin was the secret of human sorrow, and the sense of sin moulded all hopes, all anti-

1 The Epistle of Barnabas, Justin's "Dialogue" with Trypho, Cyprian's "Testimony against the Jews." A preparation for Christ through a *progressive history* was not made a systematic study till the Middle Ages, says Delitzsch "Messianic Prophecies," p. 23; but even then the history of epochs was not taken into account. Hengstenberg's "Christology of the Old Testament" initiated the new study of prophecy.

2 Preface to Oehler's "Old Testament Theology."

cipations of his national future, and the God who instilled this high hope gave him also the doctrine of a Messias. The name מָשִׁיחַ (Mashiach, or as the Greek Septuagint has it, χριστός (Christos), is used in the Old Testament to signify: 1st. those who were annointed with oil, *e. g.*, the high priest was so called, Levit. iv, 3–16; 2d. the theocratic king was called "the Lord's anointed," Ps. xx, 7; xxviii, 8, etc., and on this account, chiefly by reason of such passages as Ps. ii, 2, Dan. ix, 25, etc., it became the proper name of that descendant of David who should achieve redemption and bring to consummation the kingdom of God.

I.

It is an unfounded assertion made by some that Messianic belief was an outgrowth of later Judaism, exaggerated by early Christians to find a basis for their leader in the history of the Jews.

It was in fact interwoven with the existence of the people, as the divine promises are found throughout their written history. It finds its foundation in a sacred tradition recorded by Moses, which brings us back to the very Genesis of our race. After the fall God comforts mankind, represented by our first parents, with the promise of redemption. The Protevangelium[1] states that the human race is to gain a decisive victory over Satan. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, and he shall crush thy head and thou shalt crush his heel."[2] The conflict with evil is decided in favor of the seed of the woman. And although the prophecy is general in its tone and proper of the collective posterity of the woman,[3] we may refer its consummation, in the light of fulfillment, to that most illustrious of the seed of Eve—Jesus Christ, through whom our salvation was accomplished. Though a future victory is promised to mankind, yet the prophetic announcement taken aside from later developments is in no way determinate and there is little foundation for saying that a personal Messias is here mentioned. "But one thing was clear and sure, that paradise lost would yet be paradise regained." The circumstances of the fall and the hope for a future

1 Gen. iii, 15.

2 A literal translation.

3 The word *zerah* (seed) is generally a collective noun, at least throughout Genesis, xii, 7; xiii, 16; xv, 5; xvii, 7-10; xxi, 13, etc. Moreover it is here in antithesis with the collective seed of the serpent, hence collective itself. And as the pronoun refers to *zerah* the victory is simply promised to Eve's posterity in general. Cf. Corluy—"Spicilegium Dogmatico Biblicum." Vol. I. 349.

golden age however misshapened in their contact with idolatry, became the property of all nations, [1] as we know from the traditions of the oldest peoples, the Babylonians, Indians, Egyptians, Aztecs, etc., but successive revelations made this hope distinct to the Jews alone.

With time the great seed was limited to the race of Seth. Noe, who rightly received this name, [2] in the prophetic curse and blessing of his sons predicts that salvation is to come to the world through the *Semitic race* "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem. . . May God enlarge Japhet and may He dwell in the tents of Shem." [3] But this privilege is further restricted. Of all Semitic races it is for the decendants of Abraham, the *Hebrew people*, to verify the original prophecy. Three times did God promise him that in his seed should all the kindreds of the earth be blessed [4] and this was repeated to Isaac [5] and to Jacob [6] The passages hitherto cited are Messianic only in the more extended sense of the term, [7] inasmuch as they foretell salvation and refer to the whole Israelitic race, though they have their final consummation in Christ. The next stage of development is the designation of the particular *tribe* through which deliverance was to come. The first possible designation of a personal Messias is in Jacob's blessing of Juda, of which I quote only the necessary passage. "The sceptre shall not pass from Juda, nor a ruler from between his feet till Shiloh comes and to him is the obedience of the nations." [8] The chief importance of this passage, according to Oehler, [9] consists in showing that the government of the kingdom of God shall devolve upon Juda, as really happened under David. This verse has been variously translated at all times, but its direct signification is that Juda is to have tribal autonomy, if not authority, [10] at

1 Schaff-Lange,—"Genesis," 236. Geikie—"Hours with the Bible," Vol. 1, ch. viii.

2 Gen. v, 29.

3 Gen. ix, 26, 27. The history of the world confirms this. Though the Japhetic race has led in civilization and conquest, it was reserved for the Semitic race to preserve the true culture of God till Christ made it a universal legacy.

4 Gen. xii, 3; xviii, 18; xxii, 18; 5 Gen. xxvi, 4. 6 xxviii, 14.

7 Gal. iii, 16, seems at first sight to deny the collective meaning of *zerah*. The true signification of the word σπέρμα may be known from Gal. iii, 29. Here St. Paul refers the term to Christ's mystical body, whose unity is indicated in verse 16. Cf. Delitzsch—"Messianic Prophecies" p. 45.

8 Gen. xlix, 10. 9 "Old Testament Theology" § 229.

10 Regal authority is not here promised. Juda was to be "primus inter pares." In the desert this tribe was the leader. Num. x, 14. It encamped at the door of the tabernacle. It opened the campaigns under the Judges. Judg. 1 1-2, xx, 18. This preeminence of course was increased when the royal house was chosen from Juda. This regal authority was lost after the captivity, but the tribal standing remained the same. So numerous was this tribe that from the time of captivity it gave the name to the nation and the people. Judea, Jews, as is seen from the books of Esdras and Nehemias. Cf. Barrett, Synopsis of Criticisms. Vol. 1, 154-157.

least till Shiloh, the *prince of peace* comes, and that the Messias shall have the obedience of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. However the word *Shiloh* may be translated, the Messias is certainly meant, as we know from the traditions preserved in the three targums and the writings of the later Jews.

When the chosen people in their forty years' wandering had overrun the kingdoms of Og and Sehon, Balaam, a heathen seer, was sent to curse them, but the malediction on his lips was changed into a prophetic blessing, confirming Jacob's prediction concerning Juda. "A star shall rise out of Jacob and a sceptre shall spring up from Israel;"[1] a prophecy which supposes a personal ruler according to many. Moses himself long before Shiloh was expected in the person of an ideal king, foretold that he was to be a second Moses whom all must hear. "The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a prophet of thy nation and of thy brethren like to me; him shalt thou hear,"[2] which seems to indicate that the kingdom of God cannot attain its ideal unless its ruler is also a prophet. Thus far only had the hope for delivery been evolved up to the time of the death of Moses. Under the Judges there is a slight indication of progress in the popular desire for a king,[3] and also in the promise of a priest after God's own heart to take the place of the house of Eli,[4] but not till the reigns of David and Solomon does the Messianic idea in a stricter sense appear.

II.

With the deposition of Saul, David of the Tribe of Juda was chosen theocratic King and the prophecies of Jacob and Balaam commenced their fulfillment. After his many victories David enjoyed a long period of peace and determined to erect a temple to Jehovah, but God speaking through his prophet Nathan reserved this honor for the seed of David. "He shall build a house to my name, and I will establish the throne of his Kingdom forever. I will be to him a Father and he will be to me a son." II Sam. vii, 13, 14. This prophecy must be referred to the whole Davidic line.[5] Its fulfillment began with Solomon who built the temple typical of the Church established in *æternum* by Jesus Christ, the last of the

1 Num. xxiv, 17.
2 Deut. xviii, 15, 18, 19, quoted by Stephen, Acts vii, 37.
3 1 Samuel ii, 1-10. 4 1 Samuel ii, 35-36.
5 Cf. Ps. lxxxix, 30 seq. Zacharias who wrote after the captivity and during the building of the second temple, supposes that the true temple was still to be erected. Zach. vi, 12, 13.

line. His glorious descendant is the theme of David's death song.[1] By this covenant the idea of the theocracy is evolved, and the Jewish mind henceforth sees in its king the figure of the Messianic king. An ideal ruler, a son of David and a Son of God is to govern Israel by His right and His kingdom is to be without end. The transition from David to Messias and His kingdom was easy to the Jews of the theocracy, and thus the imperfect rule of David became the basis of their ideal, and this likeness, though somewhat nationalized at times, was retained throughout the subsequent ages of Jewish history. Jehovah was to preside over a universal kingdom through His Messias. Would this Messianic king be man or more than man? How would he rule? What blessings would accrue from his government? These were the questions which harrassed the popular craving of that time, and which found answer in the psalms and prophecies of succeeding years. The Messianic psalms extend over a period of five hundred years, nevertheless they may be said to have a unity of sentiment. They sing of the kingdom of Jehovah to be established and of the son of David who is to rule. After the kingdom this Messias was spoken of as high priest, and during the ascendancy of the prophets, he was represented as a prophet. In many of the psalms the anointed king is mentioned but not named, though from his attributes it is clear that the divine Messias is the subject of the song. David composed psalms ii,[2] xxii, cx, etc., and Solomon lxxii and probably xlv, which are all distinctly Messianic, and being sung in the temple they served to keep alive the popular longing. David's last words show that it was indeed his highest honor to be the ancestor of the Anointed of the Lord, and hence, when in his psalms he sings of a king surpassing all in glory, we are assured that he refers to his offspring Messias. Psalm ii pictures in poetic language the victory of the anointed Son of God over all His enemies,[3] and ranks among the blessed all who trust in Him.[4] He is to be a priest not of the house of Aaron, but of the order of Melchisedech, according to psalm cx.[5] Solomon in psalm lxxii foretells that Messias' name will endure forever and all nations serve Him as the Divine Prince of peace. In the xlv psalm,[6] the epithalamium, King Messias is represented di-

1 II Samuel xxiii, 2–7.

2 Although the psalm is anonymous it is referred to David in the Acts iv, 25. The Hebrew numbering of the psalms is used throughout this article.

3 Vs. 7, 8, 9. 4 Vs. 13. 5 Vs. 4.

6 Rationalists and many Protestants, among them Delitzsch and Oehler, give this Psalm a direct historical interpretation, referring it to the marriage of Solomon and the daughter

rectly as divine. The happy nuptials of Christ and His Church are the main topic of the song which received its confirmation in the New Testament acceptation.

From this is evident the great progress which the Messianic idea had made up to the time of Solomon's death (about 977 B. C.) when his son Roboam ascended the throne. Then came the division into the two kingdoms of Israel and Juda. A new stage of Jewish history and religion appears under the kings. Preparation for the Messias is now as national as was the covenant of Jehovah and David. Prophets are innumerable. We know from the books of Kings and Paralipomenon that everywhere they taught the people and their rulers, but they throw no additional light on the popular Messianic hope. In fact for almost two centuries after the division we have no record of Messianic prophecy, but there is a reason for this. Whether they really spoke of the grand reunion under the Son of David or not, the sacred chroniclers mention only what the prophets did or said, as the exigencies of their time demanded. Now there was no occasion for testifying to the Messias even with Elias or Eliseus, because their particular mission was to condemn idolatry and promote the worship of Jehovah, in a time when Juda as well as Israel had embraced the cultus of Astarte and Bel.[1]

III.

The silence of this period was more than balanced by the grand aggregation of those who committed their prophecies to writing under Ozias and his successors. Joel and Abdias who wrote about 850 B. C., though not speaking of the Messias in person, were the precursors of the most brilliant period of prophetic literature.[2] Amos foretells the rebuilding of the house of David and its endurrance as long as the people remain faithful. Abdias[3] says that the kingdom of the Lord is coming; Joel that all who call upon Jehovah will be saved in the time of sifting.[4] Jonah's mission to the Ninevites foreshadows the reception of all peoples into the kingdom of Christ; but as a rule these declarations are Messianic only in their acceptation as types of the Christian realization.

An American author[5] has well compared the prophecies of this

of the King of Egypt, or to that of Joram and Athalia. They maintain that its Messianic acceptation is allegorical and of late origin. If so, why is the subject of the Psalm addressed as *Elohim* in verse 7. On the other hand, the old traditions preserved in the targums and Chaldean paraphrase make it directly Messianic as does also St. Paul, Heb. I, 8.

1 Cf. 2 Par xii, I; 3 Kings, xvi, 31, 32; 4 Kings x, 18-28; xvii, 8-19; etc.

2 ix, 11-15, 3 vs. 21. 4 ii, 32, cf. Roman x, 12.

5 S. J. Andrews, "Gods revelation of Himself to man." p. 95.

period to a landscape painting, of which the foreground is contemporaneous history ; beyond, the shadows of exile are seen lowering, while the extreme back ground faintly outlined yet distinct enough tells of the Messianic kingdom. The present is ever changing to the prophet's eye and divers circumstances render the prophecies more vivid as we approach the exile. Osee[1] of the northern kingdom, in his rude style tells of a reunion of Israel and Juda under one leader the Son of David ; and the Targums make the sense indubitable, "They will be obedient to Messias, the Son of David, their King." Micheas clearly asserts the divinity of the Anointed One, who is to be born at Bethlehem, for He is said to exist from the beginning, from the days of eternity.[2]

Micheas, Jeremias and Isaias, at this time, each adds his quota to the characteristics of the Messias and his office, but the book of Isaias is most full of Messianic declarations. His work and prophecy were of a peculiar kind. He knew beforehand that the people would be deaf to his monitions ; and hence he looked beyond the nearing time of their penalties, for this being present to his gaze fills the foreground, and is used to symbolize the far distant future, "when the glory of the Lord shall be revealed." The Messias he portrays in the clearest manner. The "Sprout of Jehovah"[3] is his theme throughout. When the Kingdoms of Israel and Damascus formed an alliance to annihilate Juda and her royal house, Achaz placed all confidence in assistance from the Assyrian King, Tiglath Pileser. Isaias prophesies that within sixty-five years Israel would cease to exist as a kingdom.[4] He bids Achaz place full trust not in alliances but in God, who would confirm by miracle His promise of maintaining the house of David. Achaz is headstrong and refuses a sign. Then Isaias, adopting the old prophecy indicated in Micheas,[5] bursts forth with indignation ; "O house of David. Is it a small thing for you to be grievous to men, that you are grievous to my God also? Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign. Behold *the Virgin* is with child and bears a son and calls his name Emmanuel."[6] A miracle indeed, the Messias is to be born of a virgin, for *alma*, the word used, signifies an undefiled woman, wherever it is found in the Old Testament.[7] In the ninth chapter of his prophecy he looks upon the child of the virgin as already born, and he hails the great Son of David by a four-fold name indicative of his certain

1 i, 11 ; iii; 5. 2 v. 2-4.
3 iv, 2. 4 vii, 8. 5 v, 3. 6 vii, 13-14 spoken 750 B. C.
7 Gen. xxiv, 43 ; Ex. ii, 8 ; Ps. lxviii, 26 ; Prov. xxx, 19 ; Cant. i, 2 ; vi, 8 ; Isaias, vii, 14.

divinity, "Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of the World to come, Prince of Peace."[1] Though Juda will be humbled, the stump of the tree of Jesse after all reverses will still have vitality enough to put forth the branch and blossom.[2]

The prophecy of Micheas and Isaias as to Juda and Israel was confirmed by subsequent history. Zorobabel governed for a while after the captivity, but otherwise David's throne was not re-established till the day, when Jesus Christ the Son of David introduced the reign of everlasting peace[3] and the brotherhood of Jew and Gentile.[4]

Reserving the last chapters of Isaias for later consideration, we now consider the Messianic idea as exhibited in the other prophets before the Babylonian captivity. Nahum and Sophonias do not mention a personal Messias, but they dwell on the conversion of Israel and union under Jehovah as King. Habacuc predicts victory for the kingdom of the Anointed One in its conflict with the kingdom of the world. Jeremias, who was a contemporary of the former, cries aloud against the wholesale corruption of Juda, notwithstanding improvement under Josias. "How can you say we are wise, and the law of Jehovah is with us? Indeed the lying pen of the scribes hath wrought falsehood."[5] Jeremias is most violent in his attack of his times, and for relief transports himself to the days of Messias. "In those days they shall say no more the ark of the covenant of the Lord, neither shall it come into their heart. . . At that time Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered together to it, in the name of the Lord to Jerusalem, and they shall not walk after the perversity of their most wicked heart."[6] "Behold the days come, saith the Lord; and I will raise up to David a just branch: and a King shall reign and shall be wise: and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. In those days shall Juda be saved: and Israel shall dwell confidently, and this is the name they shall call him: The Lord (Jehovah) our just one."[7] Without any doubt a personal Messias is here referred to.

When Jechonias and his people were led into captivity by Nabuchodonosor, Jeremias was allowed to remain in Rama with the son of the Babylonian governor. From here he writes letters of com-

1 ix, 6-7, 734 B. C. 2 xi, 1-3, 722 B. C. 3 Isaias xi, 4-10 cf. Mich. iv, 3, 4.
4 Isaias, xix, 24, 25. 5 3 Jer. viii, 8. 6 Jer. iii, 16, 17.
7 xxiii, 5, 6, which is repeated in xxxiii, 14-16. This is clearly a repetition of the idea contained in Isaias, xi, 1.

fort to the exiles, and promises the glorious kingdom under Messias as priest and king.[1] The mother of the Anointed[2] shall bring about the new covenant, whose foundation is redemption.[3] We know its exact fulfillment.

During the captivity Ezechiel and Daniel were the leading prophets. The exiles instituting a comparison between Jerusalem and the grand Empire of Babylon, had a great tendency to feel insignificant and to lose their hope of greatness under the Messias. Consequently the many forsook Jehovah and only a remnant remained faithful. Ezechiel, who in exile received his call as a prophet, proclaims that God will plant a twig from the tree of David. The twig growing shall surpass all in splendor, while the highest trees, typical of the heathen kingdoms of that time, shall be brought low.[4] All are to be humbled until He comes *to whom judgment belongeth.*[5] One shepherd is to be appointed to feed the ideal flock. My servant David "he shall feed them and he shall be their shepherd: I, Jehovah, will be their God, and my servant David a prince in the midst of them. I, the Lord, have spoken it."[6] Daniel foretold the rank the Messianic kingdom was to hold among the great empires. Coming last in time, its head should be the Son of Man, to whom was to be given "dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that *all* peoples and nations and languages should serve Him."[7] The Jewish people are to keep a secondary place, until at the expiration of the sixty-nine weeks,[8] Christ their Prince shall come. The prophecy of Daniel, instead of recalling the people to a consciousness of their past sins, nationalized the hope of the Jews, and was made a partial basis for the later Jewish doctrine of a double Messias, of which I shall have more to say in another place.

The line of David were not all faithful to their vocation, and in the time of exile the intense longing for the Messias, the great disappointment of hope, found vent in the eighty-ninth psalm,[9] in which the psalmist looked for restoration only in the Anointed One of the covenant of David. Some looked on the Messianic kingdom as a deliverance from sin, others as national exaltation. Ezechiel made

1 xxx, 9, 10, 21. 2 xxxi, 22; of Mich. v, 2, and Isaias vii, 14.

3 This new covenant is fitly described, xxxi, 31-34.

4 Ez. xvii, 22-24.

5 Ez. xxi, 26, 27. Some think that the prophet here quotes Gen. xlix, 10.

6 Ez. xxxiv, 23, 24; xxxvii, 24.

7 Dan. vii, 14. 8 Dan. ix, 24-27.

9 General attributed to this period.

the future kingdom his special theme and his prophecy shed great light on its nature.

In the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaias, the authenticity of which has been questioned by many,[1] he introduces another, though not entirely new view of the Messias, the suffering *servant of the Lord.* The idea of a suffering Messias was the result of the consciousness of sin and the need of a mediator. It was the outgrowth of sacrifice. The seed of the woman was to gain a victory but the serpent was to bite his heel. The Mosaic law made more fully known the sinfulness of man. Through typical sacrifices and sin offerings Jewish eyes were turned to the great Mediator, who was not however identified with the Messias, till the prophets and principally Isaias made known his mission of vicarious suffering to the chosen race, not that he was to suffer for their redemption only, but that they were the only people, to whom in the present state of beliefs, the message would be intelligible.

Of the offices of the Messias as victim, king, prophet and priest[2] the last three only were told in the earlier prophets, though in point of fact Christ's sacrifice was to precede His kingdom. In the faithful periods of the Jews God did not manifest a Messias whom they would crucify. No, this was only done when they turned from Him as in the time of Isaias and the following exile. The Messias must restore justice to his people before his rule. He was to come to a people rebellious and suffering heavy penalties. God's anger must be appeased and all sins of this and other nations remitted.

The sense of sin was not enough to obtain forgiveness. Leviticus taught[3] them that the shedding of blood was necessary. The son of David, the royal priest[4] must offer the sacrifice. Thus far it was intelligible. But the priest is to be victim at the same time, and the people comforted with forgiveness.[5] Isaias speaks as distinctly of his humiliation and sufferings as he did of the sublime glory of Messias. Isaias lived just before an era of great national calamity and divine visitation. Hence the time was most appropriate for telling the Jews that the servant of the Lord would offer himself, for them "the just for the unjust[6]" and thus to fill their hearts with hope. "Thy redeemer is the holy one of Israel."[7] "Surely he hath borne our infirmities and carried our sorrows—he was wounded

1 For a summary treatment of the question, see J. Payne Smith, "Prophecy a preparation for Christ," preface xvi-xxiii. Kitto-Encyclop. Art. "Isaiah."

2 Isaias pictures His fourfold office: prophet xii. 4; king xlix, 7; priest liii, 12; victim liii, 7-10.

3 Levit. xvi. 4 Ps. cx, 4. 5 Isaias xl, 1, 2. 6 1 Peter iii, 18. 7 Isaias xli, 14.

for our iniquities, he was bruised for our sins ; the chastisement of our peace was upon him and by his bruises we are healed—by his knowledge shall this my just servant justify many and he shall bear their iniquities."[1]

The universal application of this sacrifice is known best in its accomplishment. "He is the propitiation for our sins, not for our sins only, but also for those of the whole world."[2] His death is ascribed to his own people (Ps. xxii and lxix.) when the psalmist looks into the distant future and beholds the sufferings of the despised of men in all their grim particulars.[3]

The idea of the "Servant of the Lord" in Isaias became the stepping stone for post exilian prophets to introduce the work of Messias in his image. Aggeus encourages the building of the second temple under Zorobabel (520 B. C.) and promises that its seeming inferiority to the first would be more than compensated by the presence of the *Desired of Nations.*[4] And the stock from which he will spring is now narrowed to the family of Zorobabel.[5] Zacharias following the language of Isaias and Jeremias applies the term zemach, branch, sprout,[6] as a proper name of the servant of the Lord. Behold I will bring my servant, the sprout of David,[7] and he shall build the true temple of the Lord, and uniting in himself the offices of king and priest, he shall have a reign of peace. Further on in his prophecy the great humility of the future king is attested.[8] He is to be the good shepherd, whom his own people will reject, and who will retain his throne only through his sufferings.[9] Juda is divided against itself in regard to him, but God will pour grace into their hearts and they shall weep over him whom they have pierced.[10] It was pleasing to Jehovah that the servant of the Lord, the good shepherd whom He speaks of as His close companion, should suffer for his flock. After this event the Lord shall be King over all the earth. "In that day there shall be one Lord and His name shall be one."[11]

In Malachy, the last of the Old Testament prophets, the true worship of God among the Gentiles is foretold.[12] The divine "angel

1 Isaias liii, 4-5, 11.
2 1 John ii, 2. 3 Christ himself refers to these predictions, Luke xxiv, 25-26
4 Aggeus ii, 4-10.
5 Aggeus. ii, 24 cf. Jer. xxii, 24-30, where the Messias is denied to Jechonias as he is to have no posterity.
6 Isaias iv, 2 ; Jer. xxiii, 5 xxxiii, 15.
7 Zach. iii, 8; vi, 12-13. Orient is the translation given in the Vulgate.
8 Zach. ix, 9. 9 Zach. xiii, 7, cf. Isaias liii, 10. 10 Zach. xii, 10.
11 Zach. xiv. 9. 12 Mal. i, 11.

of the new covenant," the "sun of justice," shall come to the temple,[1] but his precursor shall prepare his way.

With Malachy closed the Palestinian canon and the Old Testament testimony to the coming Messias. The Davidic period was rich in its details, but the prophetic era was even more minute. Isaias alone affords us abundant particulars for a complete picture of the coming Redeemer and King. The Gospel history can hardly surpass the tale of sorrow which the prophet places as a prelude to the universal reign of Messias.

The characteristics of this personal Messias are unveiled gradually in successive predictions. This is the reason why in none of the prophets, save Isaias, we find a complete, clear-cut, well-defined portrayal of the Messias. He is spoken of generally under some *special* characteristic, *best suited to the tenor of the time of prophecy*, to raise the drooping spirits of the Jews and throw their gaze towards the future; and in later times, as these prophetic images were taken collectively or exclusively, the Messianic idea was extended or limited. It might seem that the mutual idea of the servant of the Lord and the royal priest conflicted, but in reality they were simply the completion of each other. This is evident to us who know their fulfilment, but to the Jewish mind of those days it was a much different affair.[2]

IV.

Four centuries yet remained before the advent of Jesus Christ, and though they are often styled four centuries of silence, we have abundant Palestinian and Alexandrian literature of this epoch from which to glean the idea of a Messias. The closing of prophecy with Malachy and the institution of the scribes to preserve the sacred books had a detrimental effect on Messianic belief. Besides guarding the text they interpreted it to suit their views. The law was exalted, and to a great extent substituted for the Messias. Thus the Messias' propitiation for sin was greatly overlooked, as, conscious of their own goodness, the Jews held national deliverance as the acme of hope. They could not imagine a Christ who would suffer for their sins.

During these four hundred years the Jews were subject in turn to the Persians, Greeks and Romans, with only a short respite of one

1 Mal. iii, 1.

2 How paradoxical it must have seemed to the Jews is well stated by Canon Liddon, "Divinity of Our Lord," 88-91.

century of independence. These external influences helped to work the change in belief which we know to have existed from the writings of that time. In the books of Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Tobias, Judith and Machabees, written in the Hasmonean and Grecian periods, and received into the canon by the Christian Church, the Davidic covenant is mentioned[1] and the kingdom of Jehovah longed for. Nevertheless they are silent as to the Messias, though a belief in *One to come* is indicated in Machabees. "The Jews and priests were well pleased that Simon should be their prince and high priest forever, until there arose a trustworthy prophet."[2]

The Septuagint Greek translation of the Old Testament was completed in the third century B. C., and confirmed the Messianic acceptation of many passages,[3] though it sheds no light on the nature of the hope of the time.

The expectation of this period is best voiced in its apocalyptic literature, a product of Essenism. In these books the Messianic hope, though nationalized, shines forth as brightly as in the prophets. Jerusalem is to be exalted through the coming of her divinely sent deliverer. The Sibylline oracles[4] of the Alexandrian Jews say "God will send from the sun a King who shall cause every land to cease from evil war.—And then shall God raise up a Kingdom forever over all men.—In thee, O Sion, shall He dwell and for thee shall He be an immortal light."

In the book of Enoch the Messias is made the divine agent of retribution to the wicked after the great trials of the chosen people. "And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen shall raise up kings and mighty men from their beds; and the powerful even from their thrones; and shall unloose the bands of the powerful and break the teeth of sinners."[5] This book attempts to unite all the Messianic traits found in the prophets in one grand picture of superhuman glory. The Messias is called the Anointed, the Son of David, and once the Son of God.

The fourth Book of Esdras introduces the Messias after a period of great woe and desolation, the "Son who shall rebuke the nations for their sins." After reigning four hundred years he and all men will die to rise again in God's kingdom of justice. We cannot but

1 Eccles. xlvii, 13. 2 1 Mach. xiv, 41.

3 Gen. iii, 15; xlix, 10; Numb. xxiv, 17; Ps. ii; Aggeus ii, 8, etc.

4 130 B. C.

5 Enoch xlvi. This book is assigned to the second century B. C. by the greatest authorities, though Hilgenfeld, Oehler and others think that parts were written after Christ.

notice the exclusiveness which prevails in the apocalyptic books; the Jews and they alone are to be benefited by Christ's coming.

With the prophets chronological advance meant logical progress in the Messianic idea, but after the close of prophecy with Malachy, Jewish literature betrays a logical retrogression concerning this matter.

The Messianic hope, even in the form of national elevation, was lost to a great extent in the Alexandrian writers of this epoch. Liddon[1] adduces three causes for this: first, the greater attractions of the doctrine of Logos and Sophia for Hellenized populations; second, a diminished interest in the future of Jewish nationality caused by long absence from Palestine; third, a cowardly unwillingness to avow startling religious beliefs in the face of keen heathen critics.

V.

The nature of the Messianic idea in the minds of scholars at the commencement of the Christian era is evident from the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel.[2] Its popular form is best known from the New Testament. Each class expected the Messias to accomplish its particular good. Thus some looked for atonement, some for Jewish independence and unlimited empire, others for the union of the tribes. But diverse as this hope was in form, it was nevertheless at this time universal and intense,[3] as is evinced by the fact that all Judea went out to hear John the Baptist, wondering if he were the Christ. John proclaimed himself to be only the precursor of the Lamb of God, and consequently only the common people placed full confidence in him.[4] The Samaritans seemed to have the truest conception of the Messias and his work.[5] The Pharisees expected the sudden and glorious coming of the Messias as their political head, and hence their opposition to the humble Jesus, who assumed to Himself the titles of "Son of David" and "Son of God."[6]

1 "Divinity of Our Lord," 93.

2 For texts and their Messianic interpretation consult Westcott. "Introduction to the study of the Gospels," 124-125.

3 Matt. iii, 5; Luke iii, 15; John i, 19, 20, 41; iv, 25 etc.

4 Cf. Matt. xxl, 32; Luke xx, 6. 5 John iv, 25, 42.

6 *Son of David.* Matt. ix, 27; xv, 22; xx, 30-31; Mark x, 47; Luke xviii, 38; also Matt, i, 20; xxi, 9, 15; Luke i, 27.

Son of God. Christ applied this title to Himself. Matt. xxvi, 64; Mark xiv. 62; John iii, 16, 17, 18; v, 25; ix, 35; x, 36; xi, 4.

Others so addressed Him. Matt. xvi, 16; iv, 3; viii, 29; xiv, 33; xxvi, 63; xxvii, 40, 43, 54. Mark i, 1; iii, 12; xv, 39; Luke iv, 41; xxii, 70; John i, 35, 49; vi, 70; xi, 27; xix, 7; xx, 31.

The Apostles themselves although the constant companions of Our Lord were tainted by this belief till after His resurrection. He explained to them the prophecies relating to Him and His work.[1] Christ told them that He came "to give His life a redemption for many"[2] and to their minds this seemed cruel and impossible as they imagined He was to restore Israel.[3] His disciples tried to urge Him to declare Himself the Messias,[4] but this title He acquired gradually. Once vindicated however it was attached to His name forever.[5]

The divinity of the Christ was lost sight of in His acute expectation now as a statesman or conquering hero. When Jesus on one occasion publicly asserted His divinity, the Jews attempted to stone Him for blasphemy.[6] And when Caiphas adjured Him by the Living God to reveal Himself, Christ's answer was His condemnation.[7] He was rejected because true to the prophetic ideal, and His ignominy and death served only to prove Him the Messias of prophecy. Next to the New Testament writers their contemporaries give us the best idea of the Messianic hope in the time of Christ. Among the Hellenistic Jews the anticipation of a personal Messias had now almost disappeared and peaceful reunion of the tribes in their own territory became their hearts' desire. This is the fond hope of Philo who refers to a personal deliverer in but a single passage to which no importance can be attached.[8] Josephus does not even cherish the hope of national deliverance. Wishing to keep the favor of Rome, he does not manifest any interest in a Messias. Nevertheless he is forced to record as the cause of all Jewish uprisings against Rome in his time, the state of Jewish anticipation, which looked for a ruler of their own.[9]

The hope of the Jews at this time was well known to be the whole Roman Empire. The Sibylline oracles made popular in Rome caused a general anticipation of a golden age arising in the East. Tacitus and Suetonius[10] testify to the then universal sentiment that from Judea was to proceed the government of the world.[11]

1 Luke xxiv, 46. 2 Matt. xx, 28. 3 Luke xxiv, 21; Acts i, 6. 4 John ii, 23-24.
5 Acts ix, 22; ii, 36 etc. 6 John x, 36-39. 7 Matt. xxvi, 63-64.

8 Nonnulli etiam, nemine persequente nisi suopte metu, terga erga hostes vulneribus opportuna convertent ita ut omnes viritim interfecti cadant; egredietur homo, inquit oraculum (Num. xxiv, 7) qui bellando imperitandoque multas ac magnas gentes subjugabat, Deo Sanctis auxilium congruum subministrante. De Praemiis et Poenis. Opera (Edit. Mangey London, 1742.) Tom. ii. p 423, l 26 seq.

9 De Bell. Jud. vi, 5-4, cf. also Antiq. xx, 5, 1. De Bell. Jud. ii, 13, 4, 5; iv, 5, 2.

10 "Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens profectique Judea rerum potirentur." *Tacitus*, Hist. v, 13.

"Percrebruerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judea profecti rerum potirentur. Id de Imperatore Romano quantum eventu postea praedictum paruit, Judaei ad se trahentes, rebellarunt." Suetonius T. Fl. Vesp. 4.

11 See Calmet App. vol. iii. frag. 332.

The destruction of Jerusalem did not dispel these hopes of the Jews. They still awaited a deliverer, and in the fever of their excitement they were willing to follow anyone, who announced his Messianic mission. The historic revolt of the false Messias, Bar Chochba, in the beginning of the second century, resulted in the slaughter of six hundred thousand Jews, but even this did not put a damper on their hope, for in their subsequent dispersion they have followed at various times no less than twenty-four false Messias.[1] They longed for an *avenger* and this craving shaped their Messianic hope.

The Christians having united all the prophecies in Jesus, the Jews found themselves in a quandary, as to them the Messias was to be a glorious conqueror restoring Israel. A tone of sorrowful disappointment pervades the Mishna and Gemara. The idea of a suffering Messias was repugnant to their biased view; and only after the seventh century did the influence of the Babylonian Gemara help to spread the doctrine of a twofold Messias, and thus attempt to solve the difficulty. The glorious Messias, Ben David, was to be preceded by the suffering Messias, Ben Joseph, and to the latter they referred all the prophecies which spoke of the sorrows of the servant of the Lord. But here again the Jews were in a predicament. The early Targums referred to the glorious Messias, Ben David, many of the passages, which the later Jews would predict of Ben Joseph. Finding their position untenable they fell back upon the opinion that such passages as Isaias liii, Zach. xi-xiii, Ps. xxii were to be understood of some unknown persecuted servant of God. Thus Jewish sentiment has resolved itself into two channels. It has either reverted to the low standard of mere worldly expectation, "which looks for no humiliation in a divine Messias, but only a career of unalloyed glory," or else it has entirely collapsed in a disappointment and despair which forbid any and all speculation of a Messias. The present handful of Orthodox Jews alone await a personal Messias. The reformed Jews, in their meeting at Leipsic, 1869, abandoned the idea; and the middle party in their church, identify the Messianic time with the end of the world.

The hope for a Messias as recorded in the Bible cannot be explained on purely natural grounds. It positively supposes revelation. The Jews were continually looking for a political restorer, whereas their prophecies on the other hand show us the Messias not only as

1 For a concise and brief account of the false Christs, see McClintock and Strong. Ency. vol. 142 seq.

divine ruler, but also as priest, prophet and man of sorrow, who should make no distinction between Jew and Gentile, a thought which was averse to all *natural* Jewish sentiment. The Messianic idea was founded on a revelation, and through later revelations it acquired its full development.

We have traced the trend of the Jewish mind through five succeeding epochs and our conclusion is that of Christianity. That the Messias has come cannot be gainsaid, when we consider that all vestige of authority and even tribal unity has passed from Juda; the seventy weeks of Daniel have elapsed; the sacrifice and oblation have ceased; the second temple has been long since a thing of the past. The work attributed to Messias in Dan. ix, 24-27 and throughout Isaias has been accomplished. In Jesus Christ as the soul of the world's history, do all the prophecies find fulfillment. He was born of a virgin at Bethlehem. He was a prophet. He was a king, though His kingdom was not of this world. He appeared in the second temple. He worked the most astounding miracles and thereby established the divinity He claimed to possess. He united Jew and Gentile in His Church. He suffered and died to redeem mankind. The very circumstances of His passion fulfilled every minute prediction of prophecy. He rose from the dead and gave His mission of salvation to the Apostles, who in His name have brought the world to recognize Jesus as the Christ, the Redeemer, the Son of the Living God.

JOSEPH M. GLEASON.

Catholic University, Washington.

ECCLESIASTICAL STUDENTS IN VACATION.

THERE can be no question as to the necessity of vacations for the boy or youth who, during nine or ten months in succession, applies himself to the scholastic duties of our regular seminary life. An interruption, during the hot season, of the routine studies and of that severer discipline which is otherwise essential to form men who are to be ready hereafter for every sacrifice of self-will through a sense of duty, of natural affection for the sake of pastoral charity, of comfort, even of health and life when there is question of saving souls, a temporary relaxation from the strain implied in this preparatory work for the actual life of the priestly mission has its wholesome results. It is the rest of the soldier after drill time. Perhaps in the combat later on there will be no rest, because it is then a question not of gathering strength for the fight, but of gaining the victory at the cost of life. The man of the world seeks repose after work and it is lawful for him if he does not seek it apart from God. With the priest the legitimacy of seeking rest depends on the state of things around him. When people are dying of pestilence or fever, then repose, short of that which necessity forces from him amid zealous endeavors to aid the sick, is a crime. Like the soldier in battle, he is pledged to fight unto death or bear the stigma of a deserter. This character of the priestly life, implying an exceptional devotion to duty, gives us at the same time a cue to the meaning of vacation for him who aspires to the sacred ministry. For the collegian vacation means a very different thing from that of the ecclesiastical student. The latter is not supposed to mingle with the world in the ordinary sense. His very name, cleric, is derived from a word which must remind him of the separation from men of one who has chosen the portion of the Lord. In this he is like the Levitic race of old, the one tribe which owned no secular possession in the promised land, and to which even the lawful diversions and pleasures of other children of God were not a free choice. Nor does the ecclesiatical code of discipline, in tracing the course of students for the sacred ministry, fail to make provision for vacations, and suggest means which enable the Bishop and the superiors of seminaries to protect their charge from the allurements and contaminations of secular life. St. Charles Borromeo in his excellent "*Institutiones ad Seminarii Regimen pertinentes*" [1] desires that a

1 Actor. Pars v, Cap. vii De Vacationibus.

separate house in the country be secured by the diocesan authorities where the students of the seminary might sojourn during the long summer vacations and enjoy change of scene and occupation. This plan has been carried out generally in Catholic countries of Europe, also in Canada and with some religious communities in the United States. The last Council of Baltimore[1] adverts to the fact that a similar provision is desirable for our seminaries, but recognizes the difficulties which are in the way of carrying out a system of clerical education altogether separated from secular life.

To avert in some way the danger to which the young student is exposed by indiscriminate converse outside of the seminary, where the restraining influence of well regulated discipline and community exercises are absent, the Fathers of the Council of Baltimore wish that the superiors, "on the approach of the vacations, carefully instruct the seminarians how they are to conduct themselves in all modesty and religious demeanor among their relatives and friends; what dangers they are to shun in order that they might keep themselves intact from the spirit of worldliness; how they are to occupy their time amid useful recreation, shunning idleness, which gives birth to so many vices; what exercises of piety they are to practice daily."[2]

How wisely pertinent these precautions are will be acknowledged by any observant person who has an adequate comprehension of what the clerical state demands from those who profess it. Frivolity, pardonable in a youth of the world, is disgusting in a seminarian; and he who by his indiscreet conduct draws on himself the censure of those who respect him simply for his supposed aspiration to a nobler life than that which seeks the gratification of self, is guilty of profanation not only in himself but against his cloth. The folly of a seminarian reflects on the seminary, on the clergy, and, in many cases, on the Church, whose spotless robe he wantonly soils. But the youth is not always to blame. Weakness, imprudence, sin—all are compatible with high aspirations and with a true vocation to the priesthood. The Church neither requires nor guarantees for

1 Conc. Plen. Balt. iii, Lib. v, 177.

2 Ne alumni clerici, ubi villae nondum institutae sunt, vacationum tempore, illum rectae institutionis fructum amittant, quem non sine magno suo et suorum moderatorum praeceptorumque labore acquisierunt, superiores accedente feriarum tempore sedulo eos instruant, qua ratione in omni modestia et sanctitate debeant inter consanguineos et concives versari; quae pericula fugere, ut immaculos se custodiant ab hoc saeculo; quali occupatione animi recreationes temperare, ne otio torpeant, ex quo tot enascuntur vitia; quibus demum exercitiis pietatis quotidie incumbere, ut clementissimus Deus feriarum tempus benedicere dignetur, etc.—Conc. Plen. Balt. iii, l. c.

the candidates of her sacred ministry a freedom from passions or the gift of impeccability. Judas must have had a true vocation, as the call came directly from our Lord, yet in the priesthood he found his path to hell. For that reason our ecclesiastical legislation provides certain safeguards which we can neither forget nor belittle if we wish to save ourselves from the ignominy of disgraceful conduct by those who wear the garments of the cleric. St. Charles would not permit his students to remain with their friends at home without requiring from the clergy in whose district they lived a faithful account of how they deported themselves. For this purpose he sent a letter to all the pastors of his diocese, in which he pointed out that they were to keep careful guard over the young hope of the Apostolic College, informing themselves of their conduct in the church, in public and at home. And to leave no doubt as to the care in detail which he wished them to exercise he gave them a formula in which he proposed certain questions about the students under their charge. We give below a copy of this letter.[1] In it it will be observed that the report required by the Bishop from a parish-priest regarding a student on his vacation at home extends even to visits of a few days, and that it makes the duty of vigilance incumbent upon the pastor to that extent that the latter has to inform himself of the life of the student.

The Fathers of the Council of Baltimore did not think the rules laid down by St. Charles for his day impracticable in our own times.

1 Reverende Paroche.

Cum hoc tempore, ut valetudinis ratio postulat, dilectis in Christo nostri Seminarii clericis ad suos lares redeundi facultatem fecerimus, ut ingenii corporisque vires, assiduis studiorum laboribus defatigatas per dies aliquos reficiant, instaurentve (sed ita tamen, ut relaxatio ecclesiasticam disciplinam redoleat) quo vegetiores ad intermissa literarum studia revertantur: N. N. . . ejusdem Seminarii alumnum istuc proficiscentem his tibi literis commendamus; atque jubemus, ut quamdiu istic morabitur, ejus totam vivendi rationem diligenter observes, atque haec praecipue:

An quotidie, mane et vesperi orationi vacet.

An singulis quindecim diebus peccata sua probato sacerdoti confiteatur, sanctissimamque Eucharistiam sumat.

An diebus festis Missae conventuali, reliquisque officiis In ecclesia tua superpelliceo indutus religiose intersit, inserviatque.

An ordinum, quibus est initiatus, functiones frequenter exerceat.

An doctrinam Christianam in ecclesia tua horis statutis doceat singulis diebus festis.

An clericali vestitu talari decenter utatur.

An cum laicis et praesertim mulieribus versetur.

Haec et si quae sunt alia, a te quam diligentissime animadverti volumus.

Ubi vero redeundi tempus advenerit, tu literis sigillo tuo munitis . . . quidnam in singulis dictis capitibus, aut alia in re excessus vel defectus extiterit (super quo conscientiam tuam oneramus) sigillatim nobis cumulatissime significabis.

Illud te admonemus, hoc nobis ita cordi esse, ut si unquam alias, hoc tempore imprimis a te praestari diligentissime velimus.--*Dat. Med.*

They must have felt how much harm could be done by the untutored freedom of young students who, in the brief time of relaxation, might lose the benefit of their previous careful training amid the restrictions of the seminary. Hence, we find the Bishops enlarge upon this point in the last synod. "We ordain that pastors keep constant watch upon the life and manners of seminarists living in their respective parishes, so that they may be able to give full report of their conduct." The Pastor is to employ them, as far as possible, in the service of the sanctuary, "in ministeriis ad divini cultus honorem ecclesiarumque decentiam et ornatum pertinentibus."[1] They are to employ some time in teaching the catechism to children or in carrying out some other good works, which belong to the parochial charge and which the pastor may assign them. "Ut jam incipiant apostolico muneri quodammodo proludere caritatis et zeli operibus sese exercendo, atque clericalis vitae officiis assuescant, parochus eosdem adhibeat in operibus ministerii quae ipsis competunt, in tradendis scilicet puerulis christianae fidei elementis, etc."

Such offices performed by a seminarist gradually introduce him into the pastoral field of duty; he learns to feel responsibility; a love of souls, and a care of the holy place are naturally engendered by the daily occupation about the sanctuary. It will keep him from those frivolities or from that worse, that idle apathy which vacation holds out to the student who ceases to be influenced by the home-circle where he has come to be looked upon as a privileged member because of his superior calling. And the work of zeal and charity at this time, and attention to serious things, even amid the freedom from the restraint of discipline and rules, are the more necessary to our American students, because they, for the most part, have entered the seminary at an age when their character is formed and they have already tasted of the world. The Council of Baltimore speaks of the advantage of preparatory seminaries where boys are directed from the early age of twelve to pursue exclusively the high ideal of the priestly state. But they are hardly anywhere to be found as yet, except among the religious orders of this country. As a consequence our students, who attain their sixteenth and seventeenth year before they pass into the diocesan seminary, are often imbued with thoughts and feelings wholly estranged from their true vocation, and this quite unconsciously to themselves. When they go out from the seminary they meet the old friends and associates;

1 L. c. n. 177.

they realize less the restraints of their position than its privileges, and that can only injure their souls by engendering a self conceit for which youth is ever prepared. Often, too, half-healed wounds are reopened by contact with the old poison which God's providence and the kind hand of a spiritual physician had removed, for the boy who is left in the world to the age of ripe youth rarely escapes its tainting influence when he has as yet neither the caution nor the strength of will to defend himself against it.

All this may be foreseen and warned against by the superiors of the seminary. Students, too, in most cases, start out with a good will and sincere desire to make their calling respected by their conduct. They are bidden by the rules of the Council to present themselves on the first day of their vacation to their pastor and to place themselves under his direction and care. "Ipsi juvenes statim ab initio parocho se sistant ejusque directioni et curae se subjiciant."[1]

But it rests with the pastor to facilitate or frustrate the designs of the Church in this matter. He has to encourage the boy, make him aware that he will keep a kindly but vigilant eye upon his actions and direct him in some definite way to become a useful minister and assistant to himself. What benefit might not a priest himself derive from the companionship on his sick calls, or in his instructions, of a devout seminarist; what refreshing of heart's memories in edifying reading or in the study of the ceremonies and other useful matter concerning our ministry which is so easily forgotten?

In any case, the duties of the pastor toward the clerical students in his parish are plainly marked in the legislation of our last Council, and there is no reason why these laws should be looked on as superflous or impracticable. At the end of the vacations he is *bound in conscience* to inform the Bishop or superior of the seminary, if the Bishop so wishes it, concerning the manner in which the student spent his vacation, how often he frequented the sacraments and in what manner he conducted himself exteriorly. And if the student happen to have been, for some time, away from the parish and under another's care, the pastor is, nevertheless, to seek all possible information from others so as to make himself wholly responsible and to render a complete report concerning his charge.[2]

1 Concil. Balt. Plen. iii, l. c.

2 Finitis vacationibus, parochus, gravata ejus conscientia, tenetur clausis literis Episcopum aut seminarii superiorem, si Episcopus voluerit, informare de moribus alumnorum, de eorum vivendi ratione, de frequentatione sacramentorum et assiduitate in aliis functionibus sacris, etc. Hoc testimonium illius parochi esse debet cujus directioni et vigilantiae alumni subjecti erant; quod si is aliorum sacerdotum informationi indigeat, ut certa ad Episcopum vel seminarii superiorem referre valeat, eas necessario requirat. Conc. Balt. Plen. iii, l. c

OUR PAROCHIAL SCHOOL-SYSTEM.

It is not my intention to descant upon school matters in a general sense, or to refurbish the standard arguments wherewith we insist upon our Catholic rights and their justification. My object is rather to examine the elements which go to build up to its requisite stature and robustness the professional management of our schools.

That the formation of a body of teachers and a thoroughly systematized school curriculum with due regard to modern methods, successful applications, and all-sided ability, such as to invite favorable comparison with any other in existence, were the desire and aim of the Fathers of the late Baltimore Council, is strikingly evident from a mere glance at the many wise and provisional decrees urgently worded and severely insisted upon amid unanimous *placets* and endorsed by the *definiens susbscripsi* of every Bishop and Procurator Bishop at that great gathering.

The very first decree cuts off all discussion as to utility or advisibility, and leaves no *rector missionarius* any choice in this matter of schools without exposing him to serious inconveniences. It plainly declared and decreed that :

"Prope unamquamque ecclesiam ubi nondum existit, scholam parochialem intra duos annos erigendam et in *perpetuum* sustentandam." Exemption of any sort from this decree was only to be granted after due deliberation by the Bishop concerning the serious and weighty reasons which might call for procrastination in the matter of putting up a school building. Moreover, it was to be a school, not a building only, and lest any priest should be slow about the fulfillment of this decree, the Council passed another decree, penal in wording and doubly so in execution ; viz. :

"Sacerdotem qui intra hoc tempes erectionem vel sustentationem scholae gravi sua negligentia impediat, vel post repetitas episcopi admonitiones non curet, mereri remotionem ab illa ecclesia." We see here that a pastor may be removed from his parish *ad nutum episcopi* if he does not push matters to carry out the above mentioned decree, a removal which would be the very reverse of the old *amoveatur ut promoveatur.*

Next follows a decree against the negligence of parents. It is less stringent in its penal character than the sentence which applies to the clergy. The laity are to be induced by efficacious and prudent means to aid in the erection and maintenance of a Catholic school. In exceptional cases the Bishop may allow parents to send

their children to the schools, or he may designate certain schools as Catholic apart from the parochial schools.

But what is mainly to our present purpose in the decrees of the late Council upon this subject is that the S. Congregation insisted that we should have good and efficient schools, "not inferior to the public schools."

Here, then, are the leading points requiring the attention of the clergy in carrying out the provisions of the Baltimore legislation.

1. There are to be schools in every parish.

2. These schools are to be in no way inferior to the public schools.

3. Pastor, people and teachers are to combine as equally interested in the education of the young, which implies the salvation of their souls and the honor of our holy religion. The pastor takes the initiative, the parent generously supports his efforts to secure the locality and appointments for the school, and well qualified teachers who become, later on, the mainstay and guardians of the education imparted.

There can be no doubt that the decrees of the Council, so far as their observance depended on the clergy, were taken to heart, not *propter timorem remotionis*, but because they realized the duty of the hour and the importance of the matter when once brought before them. An evidence of this lies in the fact that parochial schools have sprung up within a very short time all over the land. Indeed we doubt whether remissness in this respect has caused the removal of any pastor throughout the United States, whilst in not a few cases the enthusiasm seems to have gone to some extreme in the effort to outrival the public system.

The laity, too, were quick to recognize the advantages of a religious education, which trains the young heart to virtue, besides instructing the mind in secular and useful knowledge. The magnificent schools which dot our large cities, even in comparatively poor parishes, bear witness to the generosity and intelligence of our people in regard to a true and all sided education.

In the equipping of the schoolroom some stress must be laid on the matter of desks, charts, globes and the manifold appointments and contrivances which modern genius has placed at the disposal of the teacher and pupils. But by far the most important feature in the school-life is the professional efficiency of the teacher. The Council has very plain words on the subject:

"Whereas," says Decree 203, "the standing and growth of our schools chiefly depends upon the ability of the teachers, care must

be taken to place our schools in charge of good and competent teachers only. We therefore enact and command that no one shall hereafter be admitted to the office of teacher in a parochial school unless he have proved himself by previous examination able and fit.

"Therefore, within a year from the promulgation of this Council, Bishops shall appoint one or more priests, conversant with school matters, to constitute a 'Diocesan Committee of Examination.' Their appointment sha.l last until it be revoked, and those selected for the office shall solemnly promise the Bishop to fulfill their office to the best of their ability according to the rule laid down for the purpose of the examination. It shall be the duty of this committee to examine all teachers, whether religious of any congregation in the diocese, or seculars who wish to teach in the parochial schools in the future, and give them, if found fitting, a diploma without which no priest is authorized to permit a person to teach in his schools unless they have held the position of teachers previously to the assembling of the Council. The diploma will be valid for five years and in any diocese. After the lapse of this time another examination will be required of the teachers. To those who fail in either of these examinations, no diplomas shall be given, but they shall apply again at the end of a year. This examination will take place annually, for communities and congregations of the diocese in such houses and on such days as shall be determined by agreement between the examiners and the superiors of said communities or congregations; for seculars the time and place shall be designated by the examiners. The subject matter and questions for the written examination will be prepared co-jointly by the committee and given to those who are to be examined on the day appointed either by one of the committee or any other priest deputed by the chairman. The questions are to be retained under cover, sealed by the chairman, and which is to be opened in presence of those who are to be examined. They shall hand in their answers and explanations in presence of the committee or its deputy. The written examinations having been read and scrutinized, an oral examination is to follow as soon as possible afterwards. Before adjournment the examiners shall make up three lists for each one examined and passed satisfactorily. The first will be given to the superiors of the congregations or communities represented by the candidates for examination; or in the case of seculars to the candidates themselves. The second list is retained by the chairman, and a third one is sent to the Diocesan Chancellor."

The decrees are clear and precise. Would that they were carried out *verbis et spiritu.* No one can properly and reasonably object to the examinations for so responsible a duty as the teaching of Catholic children. We cannot as a body jeopardize the honor and respect due to our profession as the fosterers of true education by allowing weaklings, fresh from doll-dandling, to enter the school room and assume the ferule of a pedagogue, as is sometimes the case where there is no responsible supervision. It has a special irony in it when on occasions the sharp quick wits and the sharp eyes of public rivals are given an opportunity to see in the spelling, in the bad grammar and in the general lack of varied information an evidence of the magisterial shortage. What boots the pastor's *ipse dixit* of a teacher's capacity when the advanced scholars from under the trained masterhand of the neighboring public school, who have come to supply the greater need of religious instruction, discover the "breaks" and deficiencies of the Catholic teacher. Such educators do harm, for which they themselves may not be responsible, but which affects our school system all the same. Either they have not passed the examination because the decrees were permitted to remain a dead letter in the diocese, or because the examiners were of too easy-going a character, so as to let the meshes of the law out to a gross size, or, as is most likely the fact in most cases where we have deficiency, there was actually a lack of good teaching material at the command of the Bishop which did away with competition, and, hence, with the necessity of examination.

The important question raised by the consideration of such actual deficiencies is, will or can this state of things be altered? If not, then our schools, except in large cities, where talent and competition must mass talent and ability, will be likely to remain in an inferior condition. In the country our schools are, to a great extent, taught by girls educated and graduated in the public schools. These, it is fair to suppose, under the legislation of the Council calling for parochial schools, will by degrees drop from the ranks. The very attitude of Catholics toward the public school system, which is unsatisfactory to them as a rule, must bring about the eventual abandonment of the primary and normal schools on their part. Who will take the place of these teachers? The religious of the teaching orders will hardly do so, except in the case of the larger parishes, because they are obliged to observe a community life which requires a certain number in each place, whereas many a

poor mission can barely support a school with but a single modestly salaried teacher. Moreover, our sisterhoods labor, as a rule, under considerable difficulties in the way of supplying teachers. Many of them find it necessary to recruit their ranks by seeking postulants abroad. Vocations are a variable quantity, and if we were to look to this contingency for a supply of teachers for the new schools that are every year being established in this fast-growing community we should probably fall behind very considerably. I take one of our Eastern dioceses and find that there are in it thirteen religious communities of women. Eleven of these are composed mostly of nuns of foreign birth, to whom the English language is an acquired knowledge. If the teachers for our diocesan schools must, somehow or other, come from these nurseries of Catholic educators, it stands to reason that whatever value we may set on our religious orders as helps to the cause of religion, they cannot, for a long time to come, hope to compete with the public schools in the matter of technique and science. Besides, there exists in the system of transfer, as it obtains among our religious communities, a decided hindrance to efficiency in regard to thorough school-work. Our superiors may remove and replace teachers at any moment and in any way that seems proper to them. No doubt there are necessities for this and great advantages to the individual or to certain portions of the community, but it is decidedly detrimental to the cause of systematic training as required in our schools, which are to compete with the State schools, to have a teacher removed at a time when perhaps her continuous activity in the same direction is most essential to the well-being of her school. Yet she has no voice whatever in the matter of her stay or her removal, and it is frequently the judgment of a superior far distant from the scene of action which determines the position of a religious teacher.

The difficulties which we have merely indicated as causing a probable halt in the progress towards establishing parochial schools "publicis haud inferiores" may be to some extent removed by the establishment of Catholic normal schools. This is what the Council in its decree 205 says upon the subject:

"In order that there might always be on hand a sufficient number of Catholic teachers every one well prepared for this sacred and sublime office of educating youth, we advise the Bishops, whose business it is, either personally or through the authority of the Sacred Congregation to confer with the superiors of the religious communi-

ties dedicated to the duty of teaching, and so far as possible to establish so-called normal schools in houses suited for the purpose, where such are necessary and not yet established, where young persons may be taught under expert and apt teachers the arts and sciences, the methods of pedagogy and other useful matter pertaining to the management of a school."

If such schools have been anywhere established it would be well and assuring to many of us to know of their existence and working. In regard to the possibility of frequent change in the position of the religious who teach, some of the orders are so constituted as to exempt them from the harm which such moves usually inflict upon a well conducted school. The communities which are wholly diocesan can, and are likely to, preserve a good system of teaching intact. With regard to other religious bodies, any one of whose members may be in one part of the country to-day and a thousand or more miles away before the school-term expires, we see only one remedy by which they can be rendered safely efficient as teachers in a missionary country like ours. We priests are obliged to take an oath before ordination to serve perpetually the missions within our diocesan limits. Only the S. Congregation through the Ordinary can dispense from this obligation. Would not a similar restriction effect much good in the case of our religious, without in any way limiting their power for good or restraining their perfect liberty in procuring the salvation of souls? The country parishes will always suffer most if some such precaution is not adopted to secure a consistent and continuous teaching method for our Catholic schools. However valuable the foreign sisterhoods may prove in other respects it is futile to place them in competition with American born and public school-trained teachers. This, it seems to us, requires separate and careful attention just now if we are to have parochial schools *haud inferiores publicis*.

J. PRICE.

CONFERENCES.

ABSOLUTION OF CASES RESERVED TO THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

The Congregation of the S. Office has recently laid down some rules to be observed in regard to *Casus Reservati Summo Pontifici* when the Penitent is unable to go personally to Rome.

I. Regarding persons who are *not* "in articulo mortis."

a. A Confessor not enjoying special faculties for such a case may not absolve if the absolution can be deferred without causing grave scandal or infamy to the penitent.

b. In case the absolution can not be deferred without danger of bringing scandal or infamy upon the penitent, the Confessor can absolve under the condition that recourse be had to the Holy See *within a month.* If this be neglected the censure revives and remains in force after the lapse of the specified time.

c. This obligation of having recourse to the Holy See affects all who are legitimately prevented from going in person to Rome, even if the impediment be perpetual.

d. There is no distinction in the class of censures which are thus revived (after absolution) through neglect of applying to Rome within a month. It applies equally to censures *simply* reserved and to those reserved *speciali modo.*

II. Regarding persons who have been absolved "*in articulo mortis.*"

a. Any confessor may absolve a person in *articulo mortis* from all censures whatever.

b. In case of restoration to health the obligation of having recourse to Rome revives under pain of reincurring the censure provided the latter is a case *speciali modo* reserved.

The difference therefore between the first and second class of persons absolved from reserved cases by reason of necessity (scandal and infamy, or imminent death), is that the former must apply to the Holy See *in any case*, the latter *only in case of censures specially reserved* to the Holy See.

CASE OF CONSCIENCE CONCERNING BAPTISM.

N. says to his confessor: "Father, I have for years been troubled about the validity of my oldest daughter's baptism. Immediately after her birth

the midwife brought her to me in great haste and said: 'Mr. N. quickly baptize her, for I don't think she will continue to live.' I took the child in my arm, seized a pitcher of water and pronounced the words, 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' When about to pour the water, whilst saying these words, I found that I had the baby on my right arm which prevented me from handling the water pitcher. I therefore changed the position of the child, took the pitcher in my right hand, and, without repeating the form of baptism, poured the water upon her head.

"Later on, when the child got well, we took her to the church. I told the priest in charge that she had received private baptism, repeating in his presence the form and action, as required in such cases, but not mentioning anything of the delay which had occurred in changing the position of the child from one arm to the other, by which the pronouncing of the words of baptism and the act of pouring the water were separately performed although intended to be one action. He was satisfied that the baptism had been administered and did not repeat it.

"My daughter is now a married woman. She was confirmed, received her first holy communion, etc., as though there never had been any doubt about her being properly baptized. Recently I have had tormenting scruples about the matter. The change of the child from one arm to the other was accomplished as quickly as possible under the circumstances. *Is my daughter baptized?* And *if not what is to be done in regard to the Sacrament of Confirmation?*"

Answer. It may be safely asserted that the baptism as administered in the above case was valid. There are indeed theologians who with Cajetanus (Opusc. I, Tr. 26,) would not admit the unconditional validity of certain sacraments (such as Baptism, Confirmation and Extreme Unction) whenever any actual interruption has taken place between the pronouncing of the form and the act to which it refers. But the great majority of reputable authors are on the side of Suarez, Lugo, Ballerini, Kenrick and others who require simply a *moral* (not a physical) union between matter and form for the valid administration of the Sacraments, except in the case of the Holy Eucharist where a *physical* union is necessary, since the words *hoc* and *hic* can only be applied to matter actually present at the time of consecration. To quote only Ballerini in his recently published *Opus Morale*, where he sums up the teaching of Catholic theologians on this point in the following words: "Censent ergo communiter Doctores validum esse sacramentum, si moraliter uniantur: *ad quod sufficit, si ablutio v. gr. fiat immediate post prolatam formam.*" (Opus Theol. Magn. Vol. IV, Tr. X., Cap. I, 7.)

Although it is difficult to assign a definite space of time to elapse before this moral union of form and matter would cease, the com-

mon estimate allows without scruple any interval less than that consumed by the recitation of the Lord's prayer. "Moralis illa conjunctio" says Kenrick "videtur adesse quando quis verbis prolatis statim abluit, uti in more est Baptistis; vel ablutione facta animo baptizandi statim profert verba. E contra nihil perficitur si quis magno temporis intervallo vel unius Orationis Dominicae mora verba ab ablutione separet." (Theol. Moral. Tr. XIV, cap I, 4.)

A good argument for the validity of a Baptism of this kind may be drawn from the fact that the Ritual allows the application of a single form to be pronounced over a number of persons on whom baptism is conferred in case of imminent danger of death. "Si vero periculum mortis immineat tempusque non suppetat ut singuli separatim baptizentur; poterit minister singulorum capitibus aquam infundens onmes simul baptizare dicendo: "Ego vos baptizo in Nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." The Apostles seem to have made use of a similar privilege; and in these cases some time must have elapsed between the form and the application of the matter to some of the catechumens.

As for the Sacrament of Confirmation it would have to be repeated absolutely or conditionally if Baptism had been either absolutely or conditionally supplied. In the present case there is no question of its repetition, the Baptism having been valid.

IS THE DECREE "DE MATRIMONIO NON PRAESUMENDO" RETROACTIVE?

Qu. Does the recent Decree of the Holy See "De matrimonio non praesumendo" which abrogates all contrary laws, apply also to instances of the past? Here is a practical case: M. a Catholic woman was married some time ago by a Baptist minister because, as I understood from her, the priest refused to bless the marriage on the ground of a previous engagement on her part which constituted a *matrimonium praesumptum.* The young man to whom she was first engaged is still unmarried but may wish to marry at any time. Is he free by reason of the retroactive force of the late Decree and can the woman be absolved from censure and considered as legitimately married?

Answer.—The Decree "de non praesumendo matrimonio" can hardly be said to have retroactive force in the sense that a marriage previously valid or invalid, would become the contrary by reason of the pontifical document. Nevertheless in the above-mentioned case it is clear that the young man is free to marry despite his previous engagement, annulled by the subsequent marriage to another, of the woman who had had his promise. She too is validly married if there

be a mutual consent to that effect, with her present husband. It is taken for granted, of course, that there was not in what is here called *matrimonium praesumptum* the express mutual consent *in foro interno* to contract marriage, for in that case there would be no longer question of a marriage *presumed* merely but of an *actual* marriage which cannot be annulled. Both parties are *at present* in the state to which the exemption of the Pontiff applies, that is to say they are free to avail themselves of the privilege always open to them so long as they were not actually married *i. e.* without requiring the evidence of the *matrimonium praesumptum.*

In places where the impediment of clandestinity obtains the law holds that presumptive marriage binds *in foro externo et judiciali,* quia in foro conscientiae sive coram Deo, judicatur secundum rei veritatem, id est, utrum revera affectu maritali, seu animo contrahendi matrimonium, an vero affectu fornicario tantum coiverint; ecclesia enim non potest facere ut sine consensu sit verum matrimonium. "Hodie" remarks P. Aertny upon this subject "in nostris regionibus vix unquam eveniet copulam fieri affectu maritali." (Theol. Mor. Tom ii, Lib. vi, Tr. viii, 621.)

The thing therefore to do in the above case is to relieve the parties concerned from any false impression as to their condition, salva prudentia.

We expect P. Sabetti to treat this subject more at length at an early date in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

COMMUNICATION WITH THE PROPAGANDA IN WRITING.

Under date Jan. 5, 1892, the Apostolic Nuncio at Munich published the following letter to the Bishops within his delegation at the request of the Card. Secretary of State:

"Ad nonnulla evitanda incommoda, quae hisce temporibus evenerunt, Emmus Cardinalis a Secretis Status mihi in mandatis dedit nomine Sanctitatis Suae, ut Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae sicut et aliis Ordinariis in Germania significarem. quod *Si quae gratiae seu dispensationes a Sacris Congregationibus Romanis vel al aliis Ecclesiasticis Institutis impetrandae sint, eaedem non per telegraphum, sed in scriptis petantur.*"

Subsequently Mgr. Persico in a letter of Feb. 1, calls attention of all the Bishops to the custom of presenting writings intended for the Propaganda, in *Latin, French* or *Italian*, and that they should be addressed to the Cardinal Prefect and not to the Secretary of the Propaganda. Dispatches by telegraph or cable will not be recognized officially in the case of dispensations or favors asked. Whenever necessity urges immediate action the Ordinary shall have to decide unless the right of epieikeia does obtain sanctioning an exception to a general law.

ANALECTA.

DE ELECTIONE EPISCOPORUM

IN STATIBUS FOEDERATIS AMERICAE SEPTENT.

Epistola Card. Praefecti S. C. de Prop. Fide.

Illme et Rme Domine,

Benignissimo divinae providentiae consilio referri profecto debet quod in nobilissima Statum Foederatorum Republica, quam omni humanitate et cultu adeo florere conspicimus, ita Catholicum nomen constiterit et vigeat ut jam plurimum in se civium et extraneorum animos intentos fecerit et majora videatur Ecclesiae Dei in futura portendere incrementa. Quapropter cum primum Summi Pontificis benevolentia praersse me voluit huic S. Consilio Christianae Fidei Propagandae eo spectari ut potissima curam ac sollicitudinem in istam juventutem Ecclesiae sobolem converterem, quo plurimum quod dat spei felicis rerum eventus sustentarent.

Id autem eo alacriori animo mihi praestandum suscipio, quod novi quam vehementi studio in idem ferantur illustres istius ditionis Antistites, et quam solerti opera videm adlaborent Catholicae in suis regionibus fidei et tuendae et amplificandae. Haec autem sollicitudo, quam communem cum istis episcopis habeo, expostulat ut vigilem eorum mentem revocem ad quemdam isthic invalescentem in episcoporum electione morem, cui opportunis remediis mature est occurrendum.

Quaenam sit gravissima hac de re Apostolicae Sedis mens litteris declaratum est datis die quarto superioris mensis Julii a Card. Rampolla, Summi Pontificis nomine, ad Eminentissimum Archiepiscopum Baltimorensem. Cum enim tunc temporis inanes rumores spargi in vulgus cepissent de Catholicae Hierarchiae in Statibus Foederatis ratione ita immutanda, ut immigrantibus isthuc Catholicis ex variis Europae nationibus populares episcopi praefici deberent, sapientissimus Pontifex huic inani opinione quae plurimorum animos commoverat abolendae, significatum voluit vigentem isthic in deligendis episcopis disciplinam integram inviolatamque fore servandam. Id autem tanti momenti ducitur ut irrepentes quaedam in contrarium consuetudines nulla debeant tolerantia foveri.

Profecto non ignorat Amplitudo Tua, occasione vacantium Sedium episcopalium, varios isthic excitari solitos apud clerum populumque Catholicum motus, quos graviores crebrioresque sensim fieri experientia docet. Et sane quae nunc in tali causa evenire solent, ea nec levia sunt, nec obscura, nec ejusmodi quae episcopale munus candidatis clerum ac populum, praeter statuta jura, commoveri passim conspicinus ; per publicas ephemerides contentiones vulgantur et exardescunt, publice ac privatim ea de re comitia habentur, ubi proprios quaeque factis candidatos extollit, alienos criminando deprimit.

Quod vero hujusmodi contentiones alere maxime solet, studium est in unaquaque factione vehemens episcopum habendi e suorum popularium numero, quasi privatis commodis non utilitati ecclesiae per idonei Pastoris electionem esset prospiciendum. Porro cum hanc unam utilitatem in praeficiendis populo Christiano episcopis Apostolica Sedes ubique per orbem spectet, tum id maxime in statibus Foederatis Americae ubi variae ex Europa gentes, novam isthic patriam sibi constituentes, in unum populum coalescunt, unamque proinde nationem efformant.

Quapropter cum eligendorum episcoporum in Statibus Foederatis normae accurate sapienterque definitae tradantur in Conciliis Nationalibus, ac praesertim in Concilio Pl. Baltimorensi III, sedule est incumbendum ut omnia hac in re submoveantur contraria molimina. Etenim ea decreta temporum locorumque necessitatibus apprime consentanea, suffragio cunctorum istius ditionis episcoporum lata, Apostolicae Sedis auctoritate firmata, ea profecto sunt quae non possent in privatorum hominum gratiam, sine gravi disciplinae jactura praeteriri.

Haec tecum communicare officii mei duxi ut enascenti malo occurratur, ne diutius adolescat. Scilicet velim, ut clerus ac populos in unaquaque Dioecesi in primis moneatur de dolendo exitu, quem hujusmodi contentiones habent, non ideo solum quod debitam animorum concordiam disrumpunt, et ecclesiasticae disciplinae firmitatem laxant, sed etiam quod ipsis acatholicis in offensionem et scandalum cedunt. Tum etiam S. Congregationis nomine palam significent episcopi frustra prorsus ea agitari, quae praeter Conciliorum praescripta peraguntur, cum Apostolica Sedes nihil habeat antiquius quam firmitatem tueri ecclesiasticae legis quae vindex est ordinis et munimen pacis.

Interim Deum precor, ut Te diutissime sospitet.

Datum Romae ex Aed. S. C. Propagandae Fidei, die 15 Maii, 1892.

Aplitudinis Tuae,

Addictissimus Servus,

MIECISLAUS *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKY, *Prefectus*,

† IGNATIUS, *Archiep.* TAMIATHEN. *Secretarius*.

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE AD PRAESULES NEO-EBORACENSES.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles Fratres, salutem et Apostolicam benedictionem.—Quae coniunctim a vobis perscriptae sunt litterae ex aede Archiepiscopali Neo-Eboracensi, quo coivistis consecrationi Brooklyniensis Episcopi adfuturi, duplici Nos voluptate affecerunt. Patebat enim ex iis animus vester cum de religiosa puerorum institutione sollicitus, tum effundendi cupidus dubitationes et anxietates suas in gremium Nostrum, semper ad eas benigne excipiendas paratum. Ne quid itaque vestris haereret mentibus quod anxias illas et incertas efficeret, datis vicissim litteris vos adire decrevimus: hasce autem non modo nuncias esse volumus paternae erga vos caritatis Nostrae, sed etiam testes sollicitudinis quam gerimus de fidelibus amplissimam in-

colentibus regionem foederatarum civitatum Americae Septentrionalis, quae propter incrementa, quibus se istic explicat catholica religio, et praesens Nobis gaudium affert, et rerum laetiorum in posterum expectationem. Plane haec sollicitudo Nos curae expertes esse non sivit inter controversias et disputationes nuper istic ortas et animis incalescentibus actas propter conventionem initam inter Ven. fratrem Archiepiscopum S. Pauli et civiles Magistratus circa duas e pluribus scholis paroecialibus, quas ille considerat multo cum studio in credita sibi dioecesi. In huius miserae concertationis aestu mirum non est si falsa nonnunquam nunciarentur pro veris et quae suspiciose cogitata fuerant vulgi rumore percrebrescerent. Haec equidem graviter molesteque tulimus : nisi enim tempestive eo cura Nostra conversa fuisset, verendum erat ne intercideret vel magna ex parte deficeret perfecta animorum consensio studiorumque communium in unum conspiratio, quam sedulo retineant oportet sacrorum Antistites et Nos fovere adnitmur quavis ratione et ope. Propterea memores officii Nostri quod postulat ut in disceptatione causarum, quarum notio et indicatio ad Nostrum pertinent ministerium, cuncta sedate expendamus et procul omni partium studio, animum ita comparatum causae cognoscendae applicuimus, quam praelaudatus Archiepiscopus Nobis definiendam attulit, profitens se prompte et omnino pariturum sententiae Nostrae, quaecumque demum ea foret, quae sane protestatio in ipsius laudem cedit et a Nobis non poterat vehementer non probari. Quum porro naviter dederimus operam ut plenissime Nobis factorum veritas fieret explorata, recteque aestimaretur rationum pondus quae utrinque afferebantur, constituto peculiari coetu Patrum Cardinalium ex iis delecto quibus sacrum Consilium constat christiano nomini propagando, qui sese huic studio addixit diligentia singulari, propositam quaestionem eo responso dirimendam censuimus quod dilectus filius Noster Cardinalis eidem sacro Consilio praefectus iussu Nostro patefieri curavit ecclesiarum Praesulibus quae in civitatibus foederatis sunt Americae Septentrionalis. Quo pressius autem illud urgemus quod animos vestros angebat, vosque ad scribendum permovit, certiores vos fieri volumus, neminem in hoc iudicio suspicionem Nobis iniecisse timendum fore ne infesta aliqua vexatio catholicis impenderet si ea quae gesta fuerant ab Archiepiscopo S. Pauli circa scholas in oppido sitas *Faribault* et *Stillwater* a Nobis essent improbata. Quum neque idem Ven. Frater nec alius quilibet huius periculi mentionem fecerit, liquet ex mendaci vulgi rumore famam esse obortam quae vos in inanem prorsus et falsam opinionem adduxit. Nos enimvero ad huiusce causae cognitionem iudiciumque animum attulimus probe memorem studiosumque decretorum quae, praemonente hac Apostolica Sede, in Synodis Baltimorensibus super scholis paroecialibus conscita sunt. Haec quidem constanter servari volumus ; quoniam vero hoc cunctis inest legibus generalibus ut, siquid singulare eveniat nec opinatum, factum tolerari queat suadente aequitate, quod nonnihil a verbo legis recedat, facile comperimus casum hunc incidisse ; proinde moderatione ac prudentia duce potiusquam legis rigore, rem de qua agebatur iudicandam esse rati sumus. Ceterum inter sacros vestrae regionis Antistites, quos huius Sanctae Sedis observantissimos novimus et experti sumus quum ad Nos accederent, quispiam numquam, nemine prorsus excepto, visus est ambigere de doctrina ab ea tra-

dita circa scholas in quibus catholicos pueros institui oportet. Una scilicet omnium sententia est negantium scholas probari posse *neutras*, nempe religionis expertes, sed unanimiter *confessionales* adserunt (prout in regionibus evenit quas acatholicis permixti fideles incolunt), scholas nimirum in quibus pueri religionem rite docentur ab iis quos huic magisterio pares Episcopi agnoverint. Praestat itaque, Venerabiles Fratres, ut una cum ceteris dioecesium Praesulibus regionis istius connitamini consiliis studiisque paribus ne pueri catholici eos celebrent litterarios ludos in quibus religiosa eorum institutio praetermittitur apertumque imminet mores pervertendi discrimen. Quare vehementer optamus, prout vobis significatum est per sacrum Consilium christiano nomini propagando, ut in proximis Episcoporum conventibus sedulo deliberetis de rationibus ineundis quae huic fini assequendo potissime conferant. Cupimus praeterea vos enixe contendere ut qui summae rei praesunt in civitatibus singulis, probe agnoscentes nihil esse ad salutem rei publicae religione praestantius, sapientium legum latione prospiciant, ut docendi ministerium, quod publicis sumptibus adeoque collatis etiam catholicorum opibus exercitum, nihil, habeat quod eorum conscientiae officiat aut religionem offendat. Nobis enim persuasum est cives quoque vestros qui a Nobis dissident, pro ea qua praestant ingenii vi et prudentia, facile abiecturos suspiciones opinionesque Ecclesiae catholicae infensas ultroque agnituros eius merita quae, ethnica barbarie per evangelii lumen depulsa, novam progenuit societatem, christianarum virtutum decore omnique cultu humanitatis insignem. Hisce autem perspectis passurum esse neminem istic putamus, ut catholici parentes cogantur ea condere tuerique gymnasia et scholas quibus uti nequeant ad filios suos instituendos. Interim eo reversi unde digressi sumus fore confidimus ut perlectis litteris hisce Nostris, nil triste aut tericum in animis vestris resideat quod is vel levem nubeculam offundat. Certum imo Nobis est arctius in dies vos devinctum iri perfectae caritatis nexibus cum ceteris Venerabilibus Fratribus, quos vobiscum communis patriae nomen, pastoralis ministerii consortio et par in omnes benevolentia Nostra coniungit. Sit vobis cor unum et anima una, auctisque concordia viribus pergite adlaborare alacriter ad gloriam divini nominis et animarum salutem. Quo vero uberior ex laboribus vestris fructus promanet, propitiam vobis adprecamur Omnipotentis opem, eiusque in auspicium Apostolicam benedictionem vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, Clero et fidelibus vigilantiae vestrae commissis peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXIII Maii anno MDCCCXCII. Pontificatus Nostri decimo quinto.

DECRETUM DE SACERDOTIBUS RUTHENIS.

S. Congregat. De Propaganda Fide,

ROMÆ, DIE 10 MAII, 1892.

Eme ac Rme Domine Mi Obssne.

Aliquibus abhinc annis mos invaluit ut in istas provincias ecclesiasticas sub specie suscipiendi curam fidelium ruthenorum ibidem commorantium

concesserint nonnulli sacerdotes ejusdem ritus, qui uxores et liberos secum duxerunt gravissimum scandalum præbentes incolis non solum catholicis, sed etiam dissidentibus. Cum itaque innotuerit istarum diœcesium Episcopos legitime veritos fuisse quominus ex ministero cleri uxorati Religioni ac Disciplinæ ecclesiasticae grave detrimentum foret obventurum, hæc S. Congregatio quasdam dedit normas opportune servandas. Scilicet litteris diei 1 ae Octobris, 1890, datis ad Episcopos rutheni ritus præcepti :

(*a*) ut presbyteri uxorati quantocius in proprias diœceses reverti adigerentur :

(*b*) ut in posterum nonnisi cœlibes mittantur, qui sistere debent coram Ordinario illius Diœcesis ad quam pergere exoptant, a quo facultates opportunas implorent, cui sint omnino subjecti et obedientes.

Nuper vero eidem S. Congregationi allatæ sunt litteræ quorumdam ex memoratis presbyteris, petentium veniam isthic manendi et erectionem Vicariatus Apostolici proprii ritus.

Precor itaque, Te Eme Domine, ut gratum habeas ceteros Præsules istarum regionum per litteras certiores reddere, hanc S. Congregationem nedum recessisse a superius decisis, verum etiam in mandatis dare, ut eadem fideliter observentur, atque ad alios quoscumque ritus orientalis presbyteros applicentur.

Interim Eminentiæ Tuæ manus humillime deosculor.

Eminentiæ Tuæ
Devotissimus addictissimus Servus,
M. Card. Ledochowski, *Præf.*
† Andreas, *Archiep. Amidan.*
Secretarius.

Emo Domino,
Jacobo Gibbons,
Archiepiscopo Baltimorensi.

AD ENCYCLICAM "RERUM NOVARUM."

Dubia de verô sensu vocis justitia.

In Encyclica *Rerum Novarum* dicitur :

"Esto igitur, ut opifex atque herus liberi in idem placitum, ac nominatim in salarii modum consentiant, subest tamen semper aliquid ex justitia naturali, atque libera paciscentium voluntate majus et antiquius, scilicet alendo opifici, frugi quidem et bene morato, haud imparem esse mercedem oportere."

Dubium I—Num verbis : "justitia naturalis" intelligitur justitia commutativa, an vero aequitas naturalis ?

Ad dub. I.—Per se loquendo intelligitur justitia commutativa.

Explanatio.—Equidem opus operarii plurimum differt a mercimonio, sicut merces differt a pretio. Opus enim operarii est opus procedens a libertate humana, induens propterea rationem meriti et juris ad mercedem, seu praemium ; et ideo longe nobilius mercimonio et pretio, quae sola per-

mutatione absolvuntur. Nihilominus, gratia perspicuitatis opus operarii consideratur ut quaedam merx et praemium seu merces ut quoddam pretium.

Nec immerito: nam licet opus operarii nobilius quid sit merce, totam tamen retinet rationem mercis ex qua parte haec dicit ordinem ad pretium. Rectissima ergo est ratiocinatio S. Thomae I-II, Q. CXIV, art. 1: "Id enim merces dicitur quod alicui recompensatur pro retributione operis vel laboris, quasi quoddam pretium ejus. Unde sicut reddere justum pretium pro re accepta ab aliquo est actus justitiae, ita etiam recompensare mercedem operis vel laboris est actus justitiae." Actus justitiae, inquam, commutativae. Sicut enim emptio et venditio, ita opus et merces pro communi ultilitate contrahentium sunt, dum scilicet unus indiget re vel opera alterius et e converso. Quod autem est pro communi utilitate, non debet esse magis in gravamen unius quam alterius, et ideo debet secundum aequalitatem rei, quae est proprietas justitiae commutativae, inter dominum et operarium contractus justitiae institui. (Cf. II-II, Q. LVII art. 1.)

Quod si quaeratur criterium, quo statui debeat illa aequalitas rei inter opus manuale operarii et mercedem dandam a domino, respondemus: criterium illud in Encyclica dicitur petendum esse ex operarii fine immediato, qui imponit ei naturale officium seu necessitatem laborandi, ex victu nempe et vestitu ad convenienter vitam sustentandam, et ad quem primo et principaliter labor manualis ordinatur. (*Ib.* Q. CLXXXVII, art. III.) Quoties igitur opus tale sit, quod operarius per ipsum satisfaciat praedicto suo officio naturali consequendi finem immediatum laboris sui, ac merces ad consequendum hunc finem, victum nempe ac vestitum, convenientem, impar sit, per se loquendo et considerata rerum natura, habetur objectiva inaequalitas inter opus et mercedem, et ideo laesio justitiae commutativae.

Duo tamen hac in re sunt generatim consideranda. Alterum est quod sicut pretium rerum venalium non est punctualiter determinatum a lege naturae, sed magis in quadam communi aestimatione consistit, ita et de mercede generatim est dicendum. Unde firma manente exigentia ex ratione finis, victus nempe ac vestitus, convenientis, mercedi operarii ex communi aestimatione fit, aut saltem fieri potest, salva justitia, modica additio vel minutio, sicut in mercium pretio modica additio vel diminutio ex publica aestimatione, non videtur tollere aequalitatem justitiae. (II-II Q. LXXVII, art. 1. ad 1.) Alterum est quod in assignanda aequalitate justitiae inter mercedem et opus manuale, non solum attenditur a communi aestimatione tum qualitas tum quantitas operis, sed etiam tempus durationis ejus, item pretia rerum quae emi ab operario debent, ad convenientem victum et vestitum; quae pretia non sunt ubique eadem.

Quod si denique sine laesa justitia erga operarium, juxta dicta, multum juvatur herus ex opere ejus, potest hic quidem propria sponte ac laudabiliter, aliquid operario supererogare, sed hoc pertinet ad ejus honestatem quin teneatur ex justitia. Valent scilicet in re nostra principia quae dantur pro justa emptione et venditione. (*Ibid.* in corp. art.)

Dubium II.—An peccabit herus qui solvit quidem mercedem opificis sustentationi sufficientem, sed imparem ipsius familiae alendae, sive haec

constet uxore et numerosa prole, sive haec non ita numerosa sit? Si affirmative, contra quamnam virtutem?

Ad dub. II.—Non peccabit contra justitiam, poterit tamen quandoque peccare vel contra charitatem, vel contra naturalem honestatem.

Explanatio.—Ex hoc ipso quod, juxta declarata in responsione ad primum dubium, aequilatas mercedis et operis observatur, plene satisfit exigentiis justitiae commutativae. Opus autem est opus personale operarii et non familiae ipsius, nec ad familiam ipsam refertur primo et per se, sed secundario et per accidens, quatenus mercedem acceptam operarius cum suis distribuit. Sicut ergo familia opus, in casu, non auget, ita ex justitia non requirit ut merces debita operi ipsi augeatur.

Poterit tamen peccare contra charitatem, etc., at non generatim et per se, sed per accidens, et in aliquibus casibus. Unde in responsione dictum est: "quandoque."

Contra charitatem, non solum modis illis omnibus quibus homo circa charitatem erga proximum peccare potest, sed peculiari etiam modo. Etenim opus operarii cedit in emolumentum heri. Quoties ergo hic ad exercenda charitatis officia in singulis casibus ex praecepto charitatis adigitur, ordinem etiam charitatis observare tenetur. Qui quidem ordo proximiores facit hero operarios diuturnum opus exercentes in ejus utilitatem, quam pauperes alios nihil pro ipso agentes. Quocirca herus potens charitatis officia exercere operarios suos praeferre debet, eis ex charitate elargiendo, quod justitia minime exigit ut merces sic aucta ex charitate sustentandae familiae etiam operarii minus insufficiens evadat. Haec autem generice et quasi theoretice sunt habenda; in praxi enim non temere judicandum est an herus peccet vel non peccet contra charitatem.

Contra honestatem, cujus proprium est retribuere sponte scilicet et non ex justitia. Nolumus intelligere hic honestatem gratitudinem inducentem ex beneficio accepto, opus enim operarii non est beneficium, quia mercede secundum aequalitatem rei compensatur; sed quod herus ex opere operarii magnum beneficium et emolumentum percipit, quando reapse percipit, et ideo ex quadam naturali honestate recompensare per supererogationem quodammodo tenetur sicut in resp. ad. I⅔ "Quod si denique" nullo tamen jure in operario ad illam supererogationem existente, ut patet.

Dubium III.—An et qua ratione peccant heri, qui nulla vi aut fraude utentes, minus dant salarium, quam opera praestita meretur, ac honestae sustentationi sufficit, ideo quod plures operarii sese offerunt, qui parvo illo stipendio contenti sunt seu in illud libere consentiunt.

Ad dub. III.—Per se loquendo peccant contra justitiam commutativam.

Explanatio.—Dictum est quod opus operarii, quamvis merx proprie non sit, merci tamen, perspicuitatis gratia, comparari potest, quia in ordine ad mercedis aequalitatem habet totum id quod habet merx ad pretium, et aliquid etiam amplius. Unde recta instituitur argumentatio a minori ad majus. Atqui in emptione non licet, per se loquendo, emere rem minus quam ex communi aestimatione, spectata temporum ac locorum ratione, valet. Ergo a fortiori neque licitum est, sed est contra justitiam, minus dare salarium quam praestita opera meretur, id est honestae sustentationi sufficit. De hoc dubio videatur Encyclica, p. 38 et 33.

Dixi "per se loquendo;" per accidens possunt dari casus particulares, in quibus heri conducere licite valent operarios inadaequata mercede contentos. Puta si herus aut nullum aut omnino suae vitae convenienter sustenandae insufficiens beneficium retraheret, si mercedem adaequatam largiretur, imo etiam damnum exinde caperet. Hoc enim in casu ac in similibus, etsi quaestio sit prima facie de justitia, revera tamen est quaestio magis de charitatae, qua herus et sibi et aliis providet. (Cf. Expl. ad. 1m dub. § Duo tamen.)

DE ABSOLUTIONE A CASIBUS S. SEDI RESERVATIS.

Ordinariatus Brixiensis haec dubia circa decretum s. Inquis. d d. 30. Junii 1866 s. Congregationi subiecit. Quorum dubiorum I et II sententia novo decreto non approbata causam dabat, quam Dr. *Pruner* in ephemeride Pastor bonus a. 1890 p. 234 exposuit.

Beatissime Pater!

S. Congregatio Inquisitionis sub die 30. Junii 1886 ad quaesitum:

I. Utrum toto adhuc teneri possit sententia docens ad Epum aut ad quemlibet sacerdotem approbatum devolvi absolutionem casuum et censurarum, etiam speciali modo Papae reservatorum, quando poenitens versatur in impossibilitate personaliter adeundi S. Sedem?

II. Quatenus negative, utrum recurrendum sit, saltem per litteras, ad Emum. Card. Majorem Poenitentiarium pro omnibus casibus Papae reservatis, nisi Epus habeat speciale indultum, praeterquam in articulo mortis, ad obtinendam absolvendi facultatem? Responsum dedit a Papa approbatum et confirmatum.

Ad I. Attenta praxi S. Poenitentiariae, praesertim ab edita Const. Apost. sac. mem. Pii. PP. IX., quae incipit "Apostolicae sedis," negative.

Ad. II. Affirmative; at in casibus urgentioribus, in quibus absolutio differri nequeat absque periculo gravis scandali vel infamiae, supra quo confessariorum conscientia oneratur, dari posse absolutionem, injunctis de jure injungendis, a censuris etiam speciali modo Summo Pontifici reservatis, sub poena tamen reincidentiae in easdem censuras, nisi saltem infra mensem per epistolam et per medium confessarii absolutus recurrat ad S Sedem.

Quum vero inter doctores de hisce responsis dubia fuerint exorta, S. Congregationi Inquisitionis sequentia ad resolvendum proponuntur:

I. Utrum responsum ad I. valeat etiam pro casu quando poenitens fuerit *perpetuo* impeditus personaliter Roman proficisci?

II. Utrum in responso ad II, clausula "sub poena tamen reincidentiae in easdem censuras etc." referatur solummodo ad absolutionem a censuris et casibus *speciali modo* S. P. reservatis, an etiam ad absolutionem a censuris et casibus simpliciter Papae reservatis? Quaeritur denique.—

III. Utrum auctores moderni post Const. Apostolicae Sedis (contra jus commune, Cap. Eos qui 22. de sent. excom. in VIo V. 11.; Cap. Ea noscitur 59. X. V. 39.; et contra Rituale Romanum, de Poenit. tit. III. C. 1 n. 23) recte doceant, ei qui in *articulo mortis* a quolibet confessario a quibusvis censuris quomodocunque reservatis absolutus fuerit, tunc solum-

modo imponendam esse obligationem se sistendi Superiori recuperata valetudine, si agatur de absolutione a censuris *speciali modo* Papae reservatis, an hujusmodi recursus ad Superiorem etiam necessarius sit in absolutione a censuris *simpliciter* Summo Pontifici reservatis?

Feria IV, die 17. Junii 1891.

In Congreg. generali S. Rom. et Un. Inquis. propositis suprascriptis dubiis praehabitoque Remorum DD. Consultorum voto Emi ac Rmi Dni Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Generales Inquisitores respondendum mandarunt:

Ad 1. Affirmative;

Ad 2. Negative ad 1 partem, affirmative ad 2 partem;

Ad 3. Affirmative ad 1 partem, negative ad 2 partem; juxta resolutionem fer IV. 28. Junii 1882.

Vero feria V. facta de his SSmo D. N. Leoni PP. XIII. relatione in audientia r. p. d. Assessori S. Officii impertita, eadem Sanctitas Sua Emorum Patrum resolutiones approbare dignata est.

J. Mancini S. R. et U. J. Notarius.

MISSA IN ECCLESIA ALIENA.

In Sanctorien. 4 Maj. 1882 ad I.—Occurente festo alicujus sancti ab utroque Clero Dioeceseos recolendo cum Officio et Missa diversis, quaeritur num Sacerdos saecularis vel ipse Episcopus in Regularium Ecclesia celebraturus, ubi illud Festum Officio et Missa propriis altiorique ritu gaudet Missam legere vel cantare debeat propriam Regularibus concessam, an aliam quae Officio Cleri saeculari respondet quum paramentorum color sit idem pro utroque Clero? Et sacra eadem Cong. ita censuit rescribendum: Ad. I *Affirmative* ad prinam partem; *Negative* ad secundam.

(Act. S. Sed. XXII. p. 55.)

In una Ordin. Erem. Camald. de 23 Aug. 1704 n. 3704 ad 7. An Eremitis Sacerdotibus dictae Cong. Camald. occasione itineris seu alia quacumque ex causa licitum sit celebrare Missam de Requie in aliena Ecclesia, *ubi non agitur Officium duplex*, imo fiunt exequiae pro aliquo defuncto, praesente corpore, vel Anniversaria, vel aliquod simile Officium pro defunctis eo die, quo ipsi Eremitae recitaverunt Officium alicujus sancti duplicis, non obstante Decreto hujus Sacr. Cong. die 5 Aug. 1662 edito prohibente Missas defunctorum in festis duplicibus, et per consequens an hoc Decretum habeat locum tantum in Ecclesia propria, vel etiam in aliena in casu proposito?

Et S. eadem R. C. respondit ad 7: *Posse conformari* cum Ecclesia, in qua celebrant.

Dubiorum de 4 Mart. 1886 III, n. 5358.—An sacerdotibus, qui recitaverunt Officium alicujus Sancti duplicis licitum sit celebrare Missam de Requie in aliena Ecclesia, ubi non dicitur officium duplex, imo fiunt Exequiae pro aliquo defuncto praesente corpore vel Anniversarium?

S. vero eadem Cong. rescribendum censuit:

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

BOOK REVIEW.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS per modum conferentiarum. Auctore cl. P. Benjamin Elbel, O. S. Fr. Novis curis edidit P. F. Irenaeus Bierbaum, O. S. F. Cum approbatione superiorum. Vol. I.–III.—Paderbornae, 1892. Ex Typograph. Bonifaciana (J. W. Schroeder).

These conferences which embrace the entire system of moral theology were first published more than a century and a half ago. The present edition is made from the one printed in 1751 (the fifth) and is, with few changes mainly due to decisions of the S. Congregations since that time, a faithful reproduction of the original. It must not, however, be supposed that the work now republished may be looked upon as a mere literary curiosity. If St. Alphonsus availed himself of the lucid explanations and sound theological reasoning of P. Elbel he did not altogether make him useless to the student of a later day. Our author is a probabilist as the term goes among the schoolmen of our century, or to use the words of Hurter, *auctor in re morali gravis et probabilista, qui sana doctrina necnon casuum practicorum copia praestat.*

His method is eminently practical and comprehensive, whilst there is an unmistakable solidity of judgment based on fact and logical reasoning which inspires confidence as few other theologians do. Perhaps in this may be said to consist the originality and the value of the work republished with careful verification of the cited texts by P. Bierbaum. The student is not obliged to select from a number of opinions and apply principles which are clear enough in the abstract yet escape him too often in the application to concrete subjects, but he is brought directly in contact with the practical bearing of the teaching of moral theologians. Indeed the system here pursued is admirable in every respect. Every "Conference" begins with a summary of the points to be discussed. These are printed in distinct lines, numbered, and in small type, so as to give the reader in an instant an outline of the matter before him and what the author holds in each case. Ex. gr.

De extremae unctionis institutione, materia, forma et effectibus.

Summarium.

1. Extrema unctio est vere et proprie dictum Sacramentum.
2. Immediate a Christo institutum post resurrectionem.
3. Materia remota est oleum olivarum ab episcopo benedictum; proxima vero est unctio infirmi,
4. Quae in quinque saltem sensibus fieri debet.
5. Legitima forma in Eccl. Latina est: Per istam etc.

And so on. Then follow the explanations of these points in form of answers to questions, and in each instance with reference to the decisions of the Church or the teaching of standard theologians. After this come "Casus practici de extremae unctionis materia et forma." These cases of conscience are all thoroughly practical and we have everywhere, so far as a general survey of the eight fasciculi thus far issued permitted us an examination, found the answers of the author well sustained, clear and unequivocal. The concluding portion of each conference presents a number of resolutions which indicate the lines of judgment to be followed in cases of an analogous character to the ones presented. These chapters are called Corrollaria and are extremely valuable to the student.

Whilst, therefore, as will be evident from the example given, P. Elbel's learned work pursues not so much a scientific as rather a practical method, we doubt whether it be not the more useful for many of our students in theology, and even priests on the mission, than the text-books in which the philosophical element of theological reasoning prevails even as to the general and outward form. In any case, the wisdom of having republished a work almost forgotton by the majority of students in our day is apparent from the universal commendation with which the book has been received by the best living theologians and learned practical missionaries.

The publishers have done excellent work in the way of a judicious selection of type, paper and the general make up of the volumes, which greatly facilitates the practical use which such books are meant to serve. We anxiously await the concluding two fasciculi, and may then have something further to say about the doctrine of this classic theologian of the last century on several points of interest to moralists of the present day.

DREAMS AND DAYS. Poems by George Parsons Lathrop.—New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892.

The Scribners with their fine instinct for gleaning the readable among choice English letters have published a neat collection of Mr. Lathrop's poems. As to the literary merit of these verses competent critics have already favorably commented on them. Our poet is a close observer of nature, not without the influence, as would seem, of Lowel upon him. His quick intuition detects and reveals in his finely wrought lines the detailed beauty of what, to the ordinary eye, are mere commonplaces of nature. His word-pictures, like those of Wordsworth are replete with delicate yet more real than imaginary forms such as Peter Bell would never have divined. The "Rune of the Rain" is an example of this exquisite power of conversion whereby our author without suggesting any imitation of Burleigh or Longfellow or Aldrich, who saw similar charms in "The Rain," turns a homely theme into tender and graceful verse.

But that which strikes one first and last in these poems, is their subjectivity. And herein lies, it seems to us, their greater and deeper significance. Perhaps it is true of all poets that their most faithful history can be traced in their collected work; we say, in their collected work, be-

cause there we have all the moods and tenses and the voices of the acting and suffering "Ego". The writer, perchance unconsciously, reveals the tenor of his life and reflects the influence of others upon his emotions and his senses.

In Mr. Lathrop's poems we fancy to read, as plainly as in a succinct history, the gradual progress of his mind, raised insensibly by the aspirations of his heart, toward the light of fairest truth. His verses are by no means of a religious character in the ordinary acceptation of the word. On the contrary, they are the songs of an ardent though withal thoughtful patriot, entwined with lyrics of the loyal lover. Only two of them bear more or less distinctly the impress of the Catholic poet or rather of the convert to the Catholic faith, for the moral tone of all of them is such as to indicate a natural affinity to the condition of those who learn their songs at the bosom and from the chaste lips of our holy Mother. In the "Three Doves" we recognize that consoling trust which breathes forth from the heart of him who knows his country across the stormy sea and knows too that the divine Spirit which directs his flight will uphold the fluttering wings of faith and charity until the hour of rest at home. But the preceding poem "A strong City" is a much more pronounced expression of this character. A few lines draw a graphic picture of that false "progress," that eagerness for "change" which ignores the immutable truth on which all happiness of man, individually or in the State, must be rightly built up.

"'Mid the din
Two pilgrims, faring forward, saw the light
In a strong city fortified, and moved
patiently thither."

The two pilgrims, one of whom is, we may fairly presume, the gifted daughter of Nathaniel Hawthorn, our poet's wife, are not spared the world's harsh and unreasoning criticism. Few of us who are born in the bosom of the Catholic Church can form a correct estimate of the trials to which the convert, especially when refinement and social position make him all the more sensitive of alienation from former friends, is usually subjected. There is probably no separation of man from man in ordinary life so wide and deeply cut, and this by a sort of common consent all the world over, than that which is produced by religious prejudice in the case of those who become Catholics from honest conviction, and as a rule, with the evident sacrifice of what is dearest to them on earth. The cruelty even of good men in such cases allows of no healing unless by that balm which heaven distils and the hand of the divine Samaritan applies.

"So those two pilgrims dwelt there, fortified
In that strong city men had thought so frail.
. . . . Fiercest attack
Was as a perfumed breeze to them, which drew
Their souls still closer unto God. And there
Beauty and splendor bloomed untouched. The stars
Spoke to them, bidding them be of good cheer,
Though hostile hordes rushed over them in blood.
. . . . . .
For Christ was with them : angels were their aid.

When after having read "A Strong City" we come to scan the sonnets throughout the rest of the volume we meet everywhere with that Catholic thought which so often asserts itself in sincere men outside of the Church before their intellect is aware of the fact that they are professing Catholic dogma. Thus in the lines beginning

"To-day I saw a little, calm eyed child"

we have a plain indication of the belief in the sacramental grace of baptism. The deep religious conviction regarding a future state of reward and punishment, and the Catholic aspect of death as devoid of the sting for him who has learned to look upon the grave as the gate to his eternal home is beautifully shown in "Before the Snow," and in a more touching way in "The Flown Soul." Could there be a clearer expression of the instinctive hope with which man conscious of his own weakness must cling to the doctrine of Purgatory, than the words in which Mr. Lathrop, when still a Protestant, prayed:—

"O wholesome Death, thy sombre funeral-car
Looms ever dimly on the lengthening way
Of life; while lengthening still, in sad array,
My deeds in long procession go, that are
As mourners of the man they helped to mar.
. . . . . .
Ah, when I die, and planets hold their flight
Above my grave, still let my spirit keep
Sometimes its vigil of divine remorse,
'Midst pity, praise, or blame heaped o'er my corse!"

How truly blended are religion and patriotism in the heart of our poet is evident from the strong and finely rythmic appeal "Arise Americans," which points to the more urgent need of our recent civilization. The "dreams of gain" have made us forget whence comes the lasting strength of the nation. The poet recalls

"the simple and stalwart
Purpose of earlier days."

And he invites the youth of our people

"Come! Far better than all were't—
Our precepts, our pride, and our lays—
That the people in spirit should tremble
With heed of the God-given Word;
That we cease from our boast, nor dissemble,
But follow where truth's voice is heard."

Everywhere, indeed, there are gleams of light, dreams of the fair day which came to our poet through the mercy of God, and "To Rösl," whose views of life, as expressed on the subject of woman's education, years ago, convinced us that she was even then a Catholic in heart.

But we must not forestall the reading of this volume which throws light on the state of, perhaps, many cultured minds among Americans in regard to

Catholic truth. To us, as priests, it suggests a manner of treatment in our instructions, as in our intercourse with mixed society, to which we have on several occasions called attention in the REVIEW, when speaking of the subject of Apologetic Theology and our dealing with converts.

HORAE DIURNAE. Breviarii Romani. Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini Restituti, S. Pii V. Pont. Max. Jussu editi, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII et Leonis XIII. auctoritate Recogniti, Editio secunda post typicam. Ratisbonae, neo Eboraci et Cincinnatii. Sumpt. et Typis Friderici Pustet, Sed. Apost. et S. Rit. Congr. Typographi. MDCCCXCII.

This is another of those magnificent editions of the liturgical books for which the firm of Frederic Pustet has become famous. The royal type, the rich and thoroughly artistic illustration, especially in the frontispiece, the tone of paper and the elegant binding make this volume in quarto a veritable copy *de luxe* and a suitable gift to a beloved priest, whose prayer must receive additional spirit of devotion from the use of so beautiful an instrument. The Diurnal contains all the recent offices; there is a movable supplement in an attached pocket, having the ordinary psalms, so as to save needless handling of the pages. We recommend it as one of the most appropriate offerings to the cleric on festive occasions, the more so since, despite the generosity of a high-minded publisher such as Chevalier Pustet, of Ratisbonne, has proved himself to be, these works would be impossible without the prospect of at least a moderate sale.

PHASES OF THOUGHT AND CRITICISM. By Brother Azarias of the Brothers of Christian Schools.—Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1892. (J. B. Lippincott Co.)

"The criticism that business itself solely with the literary form is superficial." That is true especially of those higher forms of poetic thought which have proved themselves to be more lasting than the fashion of matter, in so much as they have become immortal by reason of that living element which a divine "afflatus" first produced in them. It may be safely asserted that Brother Azarias has done more than any American thinker to interpret for us the great masterpieces of Catholic thought, and when we say Catholic thought, it must be remembered that the best thought is after all that which grew out of a Catholic bosom.

Some of the chapters contained in "Phases of Thought and Criticism" have been published before in the magazines. They are now presented as an organic whole with such changes as were required for the purpose of classification and to give continuity of thought to the whole.

The author after laying down the principles underlying and the accidents

surrounding the act and art of thinking which he makes clear by apt illustrations from such models as Emerson and Newman, dwells upon the culture of the *Spiritual Sense.* He shows how essential the training of the soul, through the agency of religion, is to the right use of the intellectual faculties, since man's destiny altogether lies beyond the present realities which appeal to the senses. "The splendor of the divine truths" to quote with our author the words of Leo XIII, "received into the mind helps the understanding, and far from detracting from its dignity, rather adds to its nobility, keenness, and stability." Against this cultivation of the "spiritual sense" battles the phalanx of agnostic philosophers, who confining their observations to the phenomena of sense and feeling, fail to rise, nor care to rise beyond the level of the sensible. There is a subtle flattery in the sophistry of agnosticism which, together with its novelty, attracts the unwary and has made it popular with the superficial or with those to whom "all moods of change are fiats of eternal truth."

There are soul-stirring passages throughout this chapter on the "Culture of the Spiritual Sense," as for example where the author warns the youth standing on the threshold of life:

"You now look out upon the world decked in all the roseate hues that your young imagination weaves; your fancy filled with schemes of ambition; bent upon achieving success in some one or other walk of life, you are eager, even to impatience, to start out in your course, and you may think it a loss of time, a diverting you from your main purpose, to enter seriously upon the cultivation of this Spiritual Sense. On the contrary you will find it a help. The present is only a passing phase of your existence. Youth soon fades and strength decays, and as shock after shock in your struggle through life demolishes one after another the air-castles which you so long and so laboriously constructed, you will more and more feel the necessity of ceasing to lean upon broken reeds and of looking within your soul's interior for an abiding comfort. . . . In cultivating the Spiritual Sense you are also educating yourself up to the larger views of life, and learning the great lesson of patience and forbearance."

And among the means best calculated to aid us to the appreciation of this lofty and powerful sense Brother Arzaias points out three literary works containing rich and ripe sheaves of thought, and turning the mind, as it grows from various and separate grounds, to the noon-day light of the divine sun, whence all true knowledge is derived. The Book of the Gospels stands, of course, above all human work in the power of attracting and directing the soul to its true destiny. Among those books, however, which have come from the hand of man with that lesser, because only indirect, inspiration which merely echoes celestial sounds according as the region traversed favors them, there are three that stand out by their grandeur as by their distinct differences in kind. They are the *Imitation* by Thomas à Kempis, Dante's *Divina Commedia*, and the *In Memoriam* by Tennyson.

In "The Imitation" humanity finds the expression of its spiritual wants and soul-yearnings. "Pick it up when or where we may, open it at any page we will, we always find something to suit our frame of mind." In the

"Divina Commedia," we have the same themes only set to melodious music. The rarest gems of thought are put in sweetest diction and the whole welded together in perfect unity and harmony. And from the study of medieval thought and aspiration the writer turns to the modern "In Memoriam." It is a song of sorrow poured forth for years from a heart "plunged in grief at the death of a friend, harried by the spirit of modern doubt concerning the unseen universe, and by means of Christian faith and Charity, attempting to reach the haven of rest attained by Dante and Thomas à Kempis." Tennyson's tribute to Hallam is, as the author beautifully expresses it, "a highly finished expression of the heart, hunger of a soul groping after the fulfillment of its desires and aspirations, searching into science and art, and challenging heaven and earth to yield up the secret of happiness and contentment, and in the primitive instincts of human nature together with the essential truths of the Christian religion—in these alone interpreted in the light of faith—discovering the meaning of life and answers to the questionings of doubt and materialism." Herein lies the claim of the "In Memoriam," according to our author, to rank with the "Divina Commedia," not in degree of greatness or fulness, but in kind.

In his aim to present to the reader, an ideal in thought, suggestive above all to those who amid the rationalism and agnosticism which pervade modern society seek the light of imperishable truth, Brother Azarias has admirably succeeded. We have not adverted to the principles of criticism which he everywhere applies as the touchstone of what is pure and real and inspiring in literature, because we believed it unnecessary since the author is well known as a peer among literary critics. "Phases of thought and Criticism," has a permanent value, not only for the man of letters but for all those who aim at true culture.

CORPS ET AME. Essais sur la Philosophie de S. Thomas—per M. Gardair; Professeur libre de philosophie a la Faculté des lettres de Paris, a la Sorbonne. Paris P. Lethielleux; 1892, pp. VIII, 391.

There is ever demand in these times for philosophical literature that gathers up the phenomena, facts, laws of physical science and co-ordinates them into a complete system of human knowledge. The basis and frame work of such a structure was built long ago, and exists to-day in Catholic Philosophy. M. Gardair in his present essay does his part in filling in some details of the system. He begins with a study of the phenomena of the mineral world, the activity, mechanical, physical and chemical of inorganic matter. He follows these to their physical source in atoms and force, and shows them to be actually best explained in the Aristotelian theory of matter and form as constitutive principles of corporal substance. He pursues a parallel part in his inquiry into the nature of the human soul. The powers of the soul in general, and in particular, the vegetative, sensitive, intellective, these are his special themes. The inter-relation of thought and the organism, the substantial union of body and soul, the objective

dependence, and subjective independence of the soul in regard to the body—these subjects lead up to an intermediate synthesis fruitful in conclusions concerning the problem of knowledge and the relation of the cognitive powers to their respective objects, and give a strong basis for his solid argument for the liberty of the human will. This brief outline shows that the author's grasp of his subject is broad and comprehensive. At the same time he is sufficiently thorough in detail. Every chapter proves his Aristotelian instinct—his careful analysis of facts and steady insight into underlying principles. The general reader as well as the special student of philosophy will find in the book a valuable aid to a fuller mastery of a sound Psychology.

FOURTH MASS, IN C, composed by H. G. Ganss, Op. 28. New York: Wm. A. Pond & Co.

The reverend author of this Mass is not merely an accomplished musician—he is a gifted one, and a talented composer. We are rejoiced to find him devoting a talent which has earned fame in secular lines, to the service of church-music, and in a way, too, which while not disregarding the claims of art, consults for the needs of latter-day choirs. This "Fourth" Mass must attract the attention of choir-masters and of all who are interested in Catholic Church-music, as it is a striking example of the *utile dulci*. In a prefatory note, Father Ganss says: "This mass can be used for two, three or four voices. For two voices, Soprano and Alto, or Tenor and Bass; for three voices, Soprano, Alto and Bass; for four voices, Soprano, Alto, Tenor and Bass. By slight transpositions it can be used for three equal voices either male or female, (first and second Tenor and and Bass) or (Soprano, Alto and Contralto.)" If to these prominent utilitarian characteristics we add the fact that the Soprana in no place reaches higher that two-lined F, and that the Bass sounds as G but thrice, we have elements of utility of the rarest kind. In such a composition there would naturally be a great danger of tameness, and the themes are apt to be either fragmentary or commonplace. And yet within such narrow limitations—restrictions which the author with evident consciousness imposed upon himself—we have observed that he has escaped, with rare felicity, both tameness and fragmentariness. The melodies are pleasing the harmonies full. While a single quartette choir could present the Mass fully, and while indeed, two voices with the organ would satisfy the musical requirements, we are of opinion that a large choir could successfully exercise its capabilities on its various numbers—notably, the *Credo* and *Sanctus*. The proof-reading of the Mass has allowed some errors in the text, and in one place an omission of part of the text, viz., "Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, Filius Patris." These words could by easy arrangement, be set to the music of the sixmeasures immediately preceding. We congratulate the author on his success in combining the useful and the agreeable in so charming a way, and we shall look with pleasure for more of such work in church-music.

H. T. H.